DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 100 PS 010 273

AUTHOR Gilman, Ann; Signatur, Diane
TITLE An Assessment of Head Start Supplementary Training Programs in Providing Child Development Associate Competency Based Training. Volume II: Final Report - National Survey.
INSTITUTION Kirschner (E.J.) and Associates, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 1 Aug 78
CONTRACT 105-76-1158
NOTE 91p.; For related documents, see PS 010 272 and PS 010 274

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Care Workers; Early Childhood Education; Methods; *National Surveys; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Postsecondary Education; *Preschool Teachers; Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; Research; Student Characteristics; *Summative Evaluation; Tables (Data); Teacher Characteristics; *Training
IDENTIFIERS Child Development Associate; *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This final and inclusive report discusses the findings of a national survey of training programs which were intended to prepare Head Start classroom staff to meet the competency requirements of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential. Self-administered survey questionnaires for project managers, field supervisors, and trainees were distributed to all Head Start Supplementary Training (HSST/CDA) programs. Major findings were presented under the following categories: (1) Characteristics of the Training Institution, including data on types of funded training programs and geographic areas served; (2) HSST/CDA Cost Information, providing data on funding methods of the program, program costs and money spent by CDA trainees; (3) Characteristics of HSST/CDA Staff, including functional responsibilities of the staff and demographic and job experience data on field supervisors; (4) Characteristics of CDA Trainees, including demographic and job experience data, other sources of training, and types of jobs held; (5) Characteristics of the CDA Training Programs, including general information, program components, training techniques, types of academic credit, and amount of time used for training, (6) CDA Assessment, including the number of people assessed for the CDA certificate, (7) Respondent Opinions on effects of the program, greatest program strengths, and program areas needing improvement. Conclusions are reported and policy requirement considerations for HSST/CDA contractors/grantees are briefly addressed. (Author/SE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164100

KIRSCHNER ASSOCIATES, INC.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN ASSESSMENT OF HEAD START SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING PROGRAMS IN PROVIDING CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE COMPETENCY BASED TRAINING

Prepared For

Administration for Children, Youth and Families
Department of Health, Education and Welfare

VOLUME II: FINAL REPORT - NATIONAL SURVEY
AUGUST 1, 1978

PS 010273

By

Ann Gilman, Ed.D
Project Administrator

Diane Signatur, M.A.
Project Director

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106 / 2425 Alamo Avenue, S.E. / (505) 243-1763 Washington, D.C. 20005 / 733 15th Street, N.W. / (202) 638-3423
Chicago, Illinois 60606 / 2 North Riverside Plaza / (312) 454-1364

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to persons involved directly or indirectly with this study. Specifically we want to thank all persons involved with CDA training and those in the CDA programs who took the time to respond to the questionnaires, the HSST/CDA project managers, CDA field supervisors, and CDA trainees. These persons have a strong commitment to the CDA program and to early childhood education. We applaud their dedication and appreciate their support and concern.

Ann Gilman
Diane Signatur

For additional information concerning this project or the report, contact:

Ms. Barbara Bates, Project Officer
Evaluation Branch, Research and Evaluation Division
Administration for Children, Youth and Families
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
P. O. Box 1182
Washington, D.C. 20013

For information concerning the Head Start Supplementary Training/ Child Development Associate Program, contact:

Dr. Jenni Klein, Director of Educational Services
Head Start Development and Planning Division
Administration for Children, Youth and Families
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
P. O. Box 1182
Washington, D.C. 20013

For information concerning the Child Development Associate Consortium and the Credential Award System, contact:

The Child Development Associate Consortium
Suite 500, Southern Building
805 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

The National Survey of HSST/CDA Competency Based Training Programs was conducted as one part of a study entitled "An Assessment of Head Start Supplementary Training Programs in Providing Child Development Associate Competency Based Training." This work was performed by Kirschner Associates pursuant to Contract No. 105-76-1158 with DHEW, Administration for Children, Youth and Families.

This Final Report of the National Survey of HSST/CDA Competency Based Training Programs is presented in three volumes:

Volume I - Executive Summary of the Final Report
Volume II - Final Report
Volume III - Appendix to the Final Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	1
BACKGROUND	1
NEED FOR THIS RESEARCH EFFORT	8
CHAPTER II NATIONAL SURVEY OF HSST/CDA COMPETENCY BASED TRAINING PROGRAMS: METHODOLOGY	10
OVERVIEW	10
OBJECTIVES OF NATIONAL SURVEY OF HSST/CDA PROGRAMS	11
SURVEY DESIGN	12
METHODOLOGY	12
CHAPTER III NATIONAL SURVEY OF HSST/CDA COMPETENCY BASED TRAINING PROGRAMS: FINDINGS	18
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRAINING INSTITUTIONS	18
HSST/CDA COST INFORMATION	26
CHARACTERISTICS OF HSST/CDA STAFF	31
CHARACTERISTICS OF CDA TRAINEES	38
CHARACTERISTICS OF CDA TRAINING PROGRAMS	47
EXHIBIT I: LIST OF CDA MODULES USED BY HSST/CDA PROGRAMS	54
CDA ASSESSMENT	61
RESPONDENT OPINIONS ON THE CDA TRAINING PROGRAMS	65
FINAL REMARKS	73
CHAPTER IV NATIONAL SURVEY OF HSST/CDA COMPETENCY BASED TRAINING PROGRAMS: CONCLUSIONS	74
CHARACTERISTICS OF HSST/CDA CONTRACTORS/GRANTEES, FIELD SUPERVISORS AND CDA TRAINEES	75
HEAD START SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING POLICY REQUIREMENTS	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	HSST/CDA Project Manager Questionnaire (FORM NPM) Distribution and Return per Federal Region . . .	19
2	HSST/CDA Field Supervisor/Trainer Questionnaire (FORM NFS) Distribution and Return per Federal Region. . . .	20
3	HSST/CDA Trainee Questionnaire (FORM NTR) Distribution and Return per Federal Region	21
4	Categories of HSST/CDA Grantees/Contractors.	22
5	College Department Operating HSST/CDA Programs in Educational Institutions	23
6	Type of Agency Responsible for CDA Training in Direct Funded Head Start Grantees	24
7	Breakdown of Geographic Area Served by Category of CDA Training Program	25
8	Breakdown of Type of Area Served by Category of CDA Training Program	26
9	CDA Funding Categories	27
10	Average Cost per Trainee by Category of CDA Training Program	28
11	Cross Tabulation of Allocation of HSST/CDA Training Funds by Category of CDA Training Program	30
12	Breakdown of HSST/CDA Staff by Function	32
13	Breakdown of HSST/CDA Field Supervisors Responding By Category of HSST/CDA Contractor/Grantee	33
14	Characteristics of Field Supervisors/Trainers Reported By HSST/CDA Field Supervisors	34
15	Comparison of Field Supervisors with Trainees By Ethnic Group	36
16	Breakdown of CDA Trainees Responding by Category of HSST/CDA Contractor/Grantee	38

Table		Page
17	Characteristics of CDA Trainees Reported By HSST/CDA Project Managers	40
18	Characteristics of CDA Trainees Reported By CDA Trainees	41
19	Number of Trainees Receiving Training Other Than HSST or CDA	43
20	Breakdown of Head Start Staff in HSST/CDA Training	44
21	Number of CDA Trainees in Stated Head Start Program Positions	45
22	HSST/CDA Project Managers' Reaction to CDA Program Expansion	48
23	Selection Criteria for CDA Trainees	49
24	Field Supervisor Site Visit Activities	51
25	Breakdown by Category of CDA Training Program Granting Credit for Training	56
26	Hours Spent by CDA Trainees in CDA-Related Activities as Reported by Field Supervisors	58
27	Hours Spent by CDA Trainees in CDA-Related Activities as Reported by CDA Trainees	59
28	Cross Tabulation of Trainees' Progress in CDA Training Program By Length of Time in CDA Program As Reported By CDA Trainees	60
29	Cross Tabulation of CDA Trainees Assessed by Category of CDA Training Program	63
30	Projected Assessment Dates for CDA Trainees Reported By Project Managers	64
31	Projected Assessment Dates for CDA Trainees Reported By Field Supervisors	64
32	Perceived Changes Occurring in Head Start Programs	65
33	Perceived Changes Occurring in Training Institutions As a Result of CDA Training	66
34	Impact of CDA Training on Head Start Classroom Operation	67

Table		Page
35	Benefits Received from CDA Training	68
36	Areas Where Cooperation Could be Improved Between Head Start Grantees and Delegate Agencies	69
37	Greatest Strength of the CDA Program Reported by Project Managers	70
38	Greatest Strength of the CDA Program Reported by Field Supervisors	70
39	Areas Needing the Most Improvement in the CDA Program Reported by Project Managers	71
40	Areas Needing the Most Improvement in the CDA Program Reported by Field Supervisors	72
41	Areas Needing the Most Improvement in the CDA Program Reported by CDA Trainees	72

CHAPTER I
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

BACKGROUND

In 1969, Head Start had just been moved from the Office of Economic Opportunity into the newly created Office of Child Development (now the Administration for Children, Youth and Families) in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In addition to administering the nation's largest child development program, OCD was charged with the responsibility for improving the quality of all child care programs--child care programs that had more than doubled in ten year's time.

Quality child care is of necessity a function of an adequate number of professional competent child caregivers. Yet, disturbingly large numbers of persons responsible for the group care of young children had inadequate preparation for the role they were expected to fill. In response to this need for competent and dedicated child care workers, the Office of Child Development initiated and supported a new concept in teacher training: that of the Child Development Associate (CDA).

The CDA concept, which was developed and delineated by a task force of early childhood professionals in cooperation with OCD, is a national system designed to train, assess and credential child care staff. Six broad areas of competence were established as being necessary requirements for those persons responsible for providing an environment conducive to the physical, cognitive and affective development of preschool children. These basic competencies not only established the areas of competence, but also defined the scope of training and standards by which a trainee would be assessed. The CDA system utilized field-based training to achieve integration of the theoretical and practical knowledge deemed necessary for competent child care guides. Evidence of these competencies was to be assembled through observation and documentation by a CDA assessment team, one of whose members was the candidate. Candidates who could sucessfully demonstrate their competence were to be awarded a Child Development Associate Credential and become a CDA.

The CDA competencies, CDA training, and the CDA Credential award system are discussed in the sections which follow.

The CDA Competencies

The CDA competencies represent a consensus of the beliefs of early childhood professionals as to the knowledge and skill areas necessary for child care staff responsible for a group of three to five-year-old children.

In order to earn a CDA Credential a person must be assessed and found competent in six competency areas. These six competencies are:

- Setting up a safe and healthy learning environment for young children;
- Advancing children's physical and intellectual competence;
- Building children's positive self-concept and individual strength;
- Organizing and sustaining the positive functioning of children and adults in a group learning environment;
- Bringing about optimal coordination of home and center child rearing practices and expectations;
- Carrying out supplementary responsibilities related to the children's programs.

Within each of these categories there are numerous specific skills or competencies which each CDA must acquire. The CDA competencies define (1) the areas of competence assessed in the CDA Credential award system and (2) the objectives of CDA training.

CDA Credential Award System

Sole responsibility for developing and operating the CDA Credential award system was delegated in 1972 to the Child Development Associate Consortium (CDAC). The CDA Consortium is a private, non-profit corporation, funded under a contract from the Administration for Children, Youth and

Families (ACYF), and comprising 39 national organizations which have a direct interest in the care and development of young children. The Consortium's CDA Credential award system was put into operation in 1975.

Candidates desirous of assessment must first meet the eligibility requirements of the CDA Consortium. Following acceptance by the CDAC, the candidate must then complete a portfolio documenting his/her knowledge of each of the competencies and secure the two local members of the Local Assessment Team.

The next step in the CDA Credential award system is the assessment of the candidate's performance by a Local Assessment Team (LAT) composed of four persons; the CDA Candidate, a CDA Trainer, a Parent-Community Representative, and a CDA Consortium Representative.

The CDA trainer is a local professional in early childhood education who is selected by the candidate to help him/her prepare for the assessment. The Parent-Community Representative is a parent who knows the candidate and who obtains information on the candidate from the parents of the children in the candidate's classroom. The CDA Consortium representative is a professional in early childhood education who is hired by the CDA Consortium to assess the CDA candidate's competencies and to assure that the LAT strictly adheres to the Consortium's regulations for LAT meetings. Prior to the LAT meeting, the CDA Trainer, the CDAC Representative and the Parent/Community Representative all observe the candidate with a group of children and record their observations.

The four members of the Local Assessment Team meet for the first time at the LAT meeting. Everything that has been brought to the meeting is reviewed by each member of the LAT. This includes the candidate's portfolio, the observation reports of the three non-candidate members and the parent questionnaires. Focusing upon the evidence, the team members discuss the candidate's performance one competence at a time and then vote on each one. The team members then decide whether the candidate has

the requisite competency to be recommended for the CDA Credential. If the LAT so recommends and the CDA Consortium concurs, the CDA Consortium awards the candidate a CDA Credential. The Consortium awarded the first CDA Credentials in 1975. To date over 3000 CDA Credentials have been awarded.

CDA Training

The CDA Consortium is the agency responsible for awarding the CDA Credential. It is not a training institution nor does it recommend any training programs. While there is only one way by which one can obtain a CDA Credential there are many ways by which candidates can prepare for assessment. The main requirement for any CDA training program is that it helps the trainee gain the necessary skills in each competency area and thus acquire readiness for assessment. The CDA system was sponsored by ACYF as a mechanism by which the quality of care given to groups of young children could be improved. Its acquisition is viewed as an appropriate and desireable accomplishment for any and all persons who work in such settings. This report, however, is concerned only with the CDA training programs funded by ACYF to train Head Start Staff.

To develop appropriate training resources which could prepare Head Start classroom staff to meet the competency requirements of the CDA Credential in 1973, OCD began the gradual transformation of an existing training program, Head Start Supplementary Training, to achieve this end.

Head Start Supplementary Training Program

Head Start Supplementary Training (HSST), which began in 1968, was designed and funded to offer standard college-level training for Head Start staff. The primary goal of the training was to enhance staff career development. While the program was often successful, degree requirements in many of the training institutions were not always related to working with children in a group setting. Thus the decision was made by OCD to change the focus of

the HSST program to emphasize training for Head Start staff to acquire the CDA competencies. The emphasis on the acquisition of the CDA competencies incorporated child development, early childhood education and other areas as they related to working with children in groups. The policy instruction mandating this change was Office of Child Development Instruction I-33-324-1, Head Start Supplementary Training Policy. The two-track training program, HSST/CDA, began in 1973.

HSST/CDA Program

With the establishment of the HSST/CDA Program, institutions operating HSST programs were to continue to provide standard college course training to non-classroom staff and certain classroom staff well advanced in degree-oriented programs. Concomitantly, they were to design and begin implementation of a CDA training program for Head Start classroom staff.

In providing CDA training, HSST/CDA contractors/grantees had to meet specific criteria. First, the training had to be competency-based; that is it had to focus specifically on helping trainees acquire the CDA competencies. The training had to be fifty percent field-based and provisions had to be made for integration of the academic and field work. The training was to be both individualized and flexibly scheduled. This would allow the more skilled trainees to complete the training in less time and was further intended to negate trainees having to repeat material previously learned. Finally, educational institutions offering CDA training also had to offer valid credit for the training.

There are several terms which, while not necessarily unique to HSST/CDA training, are frequently associated with it. Several of these terms are described below:

Competency Based Training: Training in which the trainee is helped, usually in a work situation, to develop those behavioral skills which have been identified as indicating specific competencies.

CDA Competencies: The CDA concept is based on six broad competency areas each of which has been further refined. These six competencies were listed above in the section on CDA training.

CDA Consortium: A private non-profit corporation representing 39 organizations concerned with child development and early childhood education. The CDA Consortium has sole responsibility for awarding the CDA Credential. (See earlier section on CDA Credential Award System).

HSST/CDA Project Manager: The person who has primary administrative responsibility for an HSST/CDA Training program.

Field Supervisor or Trainer: The person responsible for the field-based part of the CDA training program. This person observes the trainees at work in a classroom and provides them with feedback on their performance as a basis for planning training experiences and assignments.

Module or Learning Unit: A learning module is a structure for experiences and activities designed to help a learner acquire and demonstrate a specific competency or group of competencies in an effective and efficient manner.[1]

CDA Trainee: A CDA trainee is a person who is in a CDA training program.

CDA Intern: A person who has applied to the CDA Consortium and been accepted by the Consortium. A CDA intern is actively working to meet the requirements for a CDA Credential.

CDA Candidate: A CDA intern who has completed all the requirements of the CDA Consortium and is now ready for assessment and a candidate for a CDA Credential.

CDA Assessment Process: Each CDA candidate undergoes a final assessment before being awarded the CDA Credential. This assessment process is the responsibility of the CDA Consortium and has four characteristics:

---

1. Ackley, D. *Developing learning modules for Child Development Associate Training; A guide*, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Department of HEW, 1975, p. 3.

- It is a team assessment. (See LAT below)
- It is a performance-based assessment. Each member of the LAT collects information on the candidates performance.
- It is a judgement-based assessment. Based on the evidence presented at the LAT meeting the members judge whether or not the candidate should be awarded the Credential.
- It is a verified assessment. It is the responsibility of the CDA Consortium representative to verify that all guidelines for the LAT have been met. Without this assurance the Consortium will not award the Credential.

The Local Assessment Team (LAT) is composed of four persons: the CDA Candidate; the CDA Trainer; the Parent-Community Representative; and the CDA Consortium Representative. The LAT has the responsibility for assessing the candidate and recommending or not recommending the candidate for a CDA Credential.

CDA Trainer: A local professional in early childhood education selected by the candidate to assist him/her in preparing for the CDA assessment. The CDA trainer is a member of the LAT, and may or may not have been the candidate's Field Supervisor.

Parent/Community Representative: A parent who knows the candidate and agrees to serve on the candidate's LAT. The Parent/Community representative obtains information from parents of children in the candidate's classroom in addition to observing the candidate.

CDAC Representative: A professional in early childhood education hired by the CDA Consortium to serve as the Consortium's Representative on the LAT. The CDAC Representative observes and interviews the CDA candidate.

LAT Meeting: As the final step in the assessment process the four members of the LAT meet to review all the documents of the candidate's competence and to reach a consensus as to his/her competence.

Portfolio: Each CDA candidate compiles a portfolio which documents

his/her understanding of or ability to implement the various concepts embodied in the CDA competencies. This is the document the candidate brings to the LAT meeting.

In the five years since the HSST/CDA program was initiated, the various HSST/CDA training institutions, while complying with the basic objectives of the HSST/CDA training program did so with numerous variations and innovations. It is these different approaches which this survey is intended to identify.

NEED FOR THIS RESEARCH EFFORT

ACYF, having expanded the HSST program to include CDA competency-based training, then wished to examine the effectiveness of the HSST/CDA program. A two phased research effort was designed to achieve this. Phase One was the conduct of a national survey of all HSST/CDA programs in an attempt to answer the following questions:

- Were HSST/CDA training institutions providing CDA training which met ACYF requirements?
- What were the different approaches being used by the various HSST/CDA training institutions ?
- What were the characteristics of the HSST/CDA training institutions, their personnel and their trainees?
- What was the effect of HSST/CDA training: on the persons and institutions responsible for the training? On the trainees? On the Head Start programs which employed the trainees?

Phase Two was the conduct of a national study of selected HSST/CDA trainees and institutions. The questions to be answered by this study were:

- What was the relationship between participation in an HSST/CDA training program and effective performance in the CDA Credential Award System?
- Were there differences between HSST/CDA training programs, and if so, was there a relationship between these differences and program effectiveness?

ACYF contracted with Kirschner Associates, Inc. to conduct this research effort. This report is a summary of the findings and conclusions of the national survey phase of the research (Phase I).

CHAPTER II
NATIONAL SURVEY OF HSST/CDA COMPETENCY BASED TRAINING PROGRAMS: METHODOLOGY

OVERVIEW

The national survey of HSST/CDA training programs constitutes Phase I of this project and is the subject of this report. Phase II of this project, a national study of the effectiveness of HSST/CDA training programs was conducted concurrently and in relation to the national survey.

The national survey of HSST/CDA training programs, Phase I, entailed the collection of current, complete and correct information from HSST/CDA programs, their sponsoring institutions, the persons who direct, supervise and teach in them, the sites at which the training is provided, and the characteristics of the persons who receive the training. Further, this information had to be sufficiently detailed to make possible a determination of per-trainee, per-year costs by category of HSST/CDA training program.

The primary purpose of Phase II of this research effort, the study of HSST/CDA training programs, was to provide information on the effectiveness of the HSST/CDA program as it relates to preparing trainees for assessment by the CDA Consortium. To accomplish this, sample study groups of second year, first year, and potential CDA trainees were selected for the study. Each participant's formal Child Development Associate assessment results will be analyzed across study group and in conjunction with detailed data on training methods provided by the participant's CDA training program. The information obtained in Phase I, the national survey of HSST/CDA programs is an integral part of the data base used in the study. The design methodology and results of the study of HSST/CDA training programs are to be presented in a separate report. This report presents the design methodology and results of the national survey only.

OBJECTIVES OF NATIONAL SURVEY OF HSST/CDA PROGRAMS

The questions to be answered by this survey were:

- Were HSST/CDA training institutions providing CDA training which met ACYF requirements?
- What were the different approaches being used by the various HSST/CDA training institutions?
- What were the characteristics of the HSST/CDA training institutions, their personnel and their trainees?
- What was the effect of HSST/CDA training: on the persons and institutions responsible for the training: On the trainees? On the Head Start programs which employed the trainees?

Among the key variables which needed to be identified were:

-Who fulfills the role of field supervisor?

-What types of CDA training materials are used?

-How many institutions give college credit for training? If so, what is the nature of the credit?

-What are the ways used to integrate academic and field training?

-How long does it take a trainee to complete the training?

-What are the average costs per CDA training?

-How many CDA Trainees have received their CDA Credential?

-Does participation in HSST/CDA training affect the career plans of the CDA trainees?

-Why do some trainees drop out of training?

-What are the strengths of the HSST/CDA training program?

-Are there changes in sponsoring institutions, Head Start grantees and trainees which are attributable to HSST/CDA training?

The remainder of this chapter presents the design and methodology used in the conduct of this survey. The findings of the survey are reported in Chapter III. In the final chapter of the report, the findings of the survey are interpreted as they relate to the objectives and key variables.

SURVEY DESIGN

The national survey of all HSST/CDA programs required a questionnaire survey of all HSST/CDA Project Managers, CDA Field Supervisors, and a sample of current CDA trainees. The questionnaires provided program, cost, staff and trainee data, as well as background information on field supervisors and trainees.

Preliminary work for Phase I began late in 1976. Initially, all HSST/CDA programs were contacted and requested to provide information on numbers of field supervisors and CDA trainees in their program to determine the number of questionnaires to be sent. This information was collected by March of 1977. However, due to delays incurred during the clearance of survey instruments by the Office of Management and Budget, the national survey could not be undertaken during the 1976-77 program year. Consequently, all programs were contacted again in the fall of 1977 and the information was updated.

National survey questionnaires were distributed in December of 1977 and January of 1978. All data obtained from survey forms received on or before July 10, 1978 is included in this report. The exact response rate per respondent category and federal region is contained in the findings chapter.

METHODOLOGY

The remainder of this chapter on the methodology used in the national survey of HSST/CDA training program is organized as follows:

- Instrumentation
- Survey Distribution
- Respondent Universe

Instrumentation

The national survey data collection instruments were developed from models included with the RFP. These were reviewed and revised by Kirschner Associates' project staff in concert with ACYF staff. The instruments that were utilized in this survey are listed and explained below. A copy of each is contained in the Appendix to this report.

The National Project Manager Questionnaire (Form NPM)

Information was provided by HSST/CDA Project Managers through a self-administered form. This questionnaire provided basic data on the CDA training program and the institutions providing training. Specifically, questions were included addressing the following areas:

- Characteristics of the HSST/CDA training institution;
- Cost of training;
- T/TA needs;
- Characteristics of HSST/CDA trainees;
- Characteristics of HSST/CDA staff;
- Characteristics of HSST/CDA training program;
- CDA assessment.

The National Field Supervisor Questionnaire (Form NFS)

Information was provided by HSST/CDA field supervisors through a self-administered form. Each field supervisor provided information concerning their training, experience, employment, and on-going supervision of CDA trainees. Specific areas included were as follows:

- Characteristics of the HSST/CDA field supervisor;
- Characteristics of CDA training program;
- CDA assessment.

The National CDA Trainee Questionnaire (Form NTR)

Information was provided by current trainees through a self-administered form. Each trainee provided information concerning his/her

CDA training, past training and experience, employment and participation in the program. These specific areas were addressed:

- Characteristics of the HSST/CDA trainee;
- Work experience/training in Head Start;
- Head Start programs and classroom environment;
- CDA training;
- Cost of CDA training;
- CDA assessment.

Each instrument was field tested prior to the national survey. The forms and survey plan were submitted to the Office of Management and Budget where they were approved for distribution. Approval number and expiration date appear on each form.

Survey Distribution

Packets of questionnaires were sent to each HSST/CDA project manager. The project manager was responsible for distributing questionnaires to all field supervisors/trainers at the programs. In addition, the project manager was instructed to select the one-third sample of CDA trainees at their program who would complete the trainee questionnaires. This was accomplished by placing all trainee names in alphabetic order and selecting every third trainee to be a questionnaire recipient. If the program had fewer than three CDA trainees, the project manager was instructed to select one of these at random.

Respondent Universe

The respondent universe comprises all HSST/CDA training programs funded at the time of the preliminary data collection effort and currently providing CDA training.

Before beginning the national survey, it was necessary to determine the size of the respondent universe. As late as 1976, all HSST/CDA grantees

had been two year colleges, four year colleges, or universities. Since that time the trend has been to provide direct funds to Head Start grantees and delegate agencies for CDA training. In an internal report to ACYF dated February, 1978, the University Research Corporation (URC) delineated the HSST/CDA contractors and grantees in each federal region. As of that date, there were 6 contractors, 38 (academic) institutional contractors and 336 directly-funded Head Start grantees providing CDA training across the nation, including the island of Puerto Rico. This breakdown, however, does not give a completely accurate picture of the structure of CDA training programs. The Children, Youth and Family Unit of each federal region and the Indian and Migrant Program Division (IMPD) of ACYF is ultimately responsible for awarding HSST/CDA monies to contractors and grantees. Consequently, there is a wide variance in funding patterns between the regions.

The funding pattern of CDA training programs as presented in the URC report is more clearly explained when broken down by federal region. This information as compiled by URC is presented below.

Federal Region	Contractors*	Academic Institution Contractors	Directly-Funded Head Start Grantees
I		6	9
II	1	(14)**	14
III	1		40
IV	1	15	3
V			192
VI		10	22***
VII	2	2	5
VIII	1		All grantees****
IX		3	2
X		2	2
IMPD			47
TOTAL	6	38	336

* Distinguished from general TA contractors
** Subcontracting institutions
*** Nineteen of these use funds other than PA 20 for CDA training
**** All grantees are involved in field services and institutional courses for CDA training

Reference: University Research Corporation, Washington, D.C.

The present regional pattern of HSST/CDA contractors and grantees does not differ substantially from the one in place at the time of our preliminary data collection effort in the fall of 1976 and 1977. The most significant change, as noted above, has been and continues to be the increase in the amount of direct funds to Head Start grantees for the delivery of HSST/CDA training.

At the time of our preliminary data collection the pattern of HSST/CDA funding is the one presented below.

- Region I - 7 directly-funded Head Start grantees;
  - 6 contractors, all educational institutions;
- Region II - 11 directly-funded Head Start grantees. Eight of these 11 grantees directly sub-contract with 10 educational institutions to provide CDA training;
- Region III - 14 directly-funded Head Start grantees;
  - 3 sub-contractors, all educational institutions;
- Region IV - 1 directly-funded grantee with sub-contracts to 15 educational institutions and 3 Head Start programs to provide CDA training across the region;
- Region V - 198 Head Start grantees are directly funded. Only the 30 Head Start grantees who previously had HSST/CDA training and are currently providing training are included in this study;
- Region VI - 2 directly-funded Head Start grantees or delegate agencies;
  - 10 contractors, all educational institutions;
- Region VII - 5 directly-funded Head Start grantees;
  - 4 contractors: 2 are educational institutions
    2 are private firms;
- Region VIII - 1 contractor , a private firm, serving 46 Head Start grantees across the region;
- Region IX - 2 directly-funded Head Start grantees;
  - 2 contractors, both educational institutions;
- Region X - 2 directly-funded Head Start grantees;
  - 3 contractors, 2 of which are education institutions, and one a private firm
- IMPD - 21 directly-funded Head Start grantees.

These total 133 HSST/CDA programs constitute the respondent universe for the national survey. Programs were included that were funded through the second year of this study, at the time the survey was initiated.

The respondent universe can be further broken down into the following categories:

- HSST/CDA Project Managers: Those persons at the funded institution or Head Start grantee who are ultimately responsible for the operation of the CDA training program. The maximum size of this group is 133.

- CDA Field Supervisors/Trainers: Those persons responsible for providing field training and supervision to CDA trainees at the funded program. The maximum size of this group is 458.

- CDA Trainees: Those persons who are currently enrolled in CDA training at the funded programs. One-third of all current CDA trainees were surveyed, constituting a maximum response rate of 1324.

CHAPTER III
NATIONAL SURVEY OF HSST/CDA COMPETENCY BASED TRAINING PROGRAMS: FINDINGS

In Chapter II the methodology used in collecting information for the national survey of HSST/CDA training contractors/grantees was described. The findings reported in this chapter are based on the number of respondents reporting by July 10, 1978. For each group, the number of respondents is as follows:

- HSST/CDA Project Managers: 80/133 = 60%
- CDA Field Supervisors: 225/458 = 49%
- CDA Trainees: 392/1324 = 30%

Tables 1, 2 and 3 give a presentation of the percentage of HSST/CDA Project Managers, Field Supervisor/Trainers, and a sample of CDA Trainees, respectively, responding for each federal region.

The findings of the national survey presented in this chapter are reported under the following headings:

- Characteristics of the Training Institution;
- HSST/CDA Information;
- Characteristics of HSST/CDA Staff;
- Characteristics of HSST/CDA Trainees;
- Characteristcs of HSST/CDA Program;
- CDA Assessment;
- Respondent Opinions on the CDA Training Programs.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

All information on the characteristics of HSST/CDA training institutions was obtained from the 80 project manager questionnaires (NPM) returned.

TABLE 1

HSST/CDA PROJECT MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM NPM)

DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN PER FEDERAL REGION

Federal Region	Number of HSST/CDA Project Manager Forms Returned	Total Number of HSST/CDA Project Manager Forms Distributed	Percent Responding Per Region
1	11	13	85
2	9	12	75
3	7	10	70
4	12	18	67
5	10	30	33
6	11	12	92
7	6	9	67
8	1	1	100
9	3	4	75
10	5	5	100
IMPD	5	19	26
TOTAL	80	133	60

TABLE 2

HSST/CDA FIELD SUPERVISOR/TRAINER QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM NFS)

DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN PER FEDERAL REGION

Federal Region	Number of HSST/CDA Field Supervisor/Trainer Forms Returned	Total Number of HSST/CDA Field Supervisor/Trainer Forms Distributed	Percent Responding Per Region
1	34	63	54
2	11	28	39
3	16	26	62
4	21	40	53
5	16	46	35
6	30	41	73
7	8	35	23
8	30	60	50
9	29	58	50
10	24	35	69
IMPD	6	26	23
TOTAL	225	458	49

TABLE 3

HSST/CDA TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE (FORM NTR)

DISTRIBUTION AND RETURN PER FEDERAL REGION

Federal Region	Number of HSST/CDA Trainee Forms Returned	Total Number of HSST/CDA Trainee Forms Distributed*	Percent Responding Per Region
1	33	75	44
2	23	73	32
3	33	78	42
4	60	211	28
5	23	110	21
6	107	255	42
7	23	105	22
8	33	96	34
9	23	227	10
10	24	50	48
IMPD	10	44	23
TOTAL	392	1324	30

* CDA Trainee forms were distributed by HSST/CDA Project Managers to a sample of approximately one-third of their current CDA trainees.

The training programs have been divided into three general categories: educational institutions, Head Start grantees, and others (private contracting firms are included here). Educational institutions have been further subdivided into two year colleges, four year colleges and universities. Table 4 shows the number of HSST/CDA grantees and contractors broken out by type of funded training program.

TABLE 4

BREAKDOWN OF CATEGORIES OF HSST/CDA GRANTEES/CONTRACTORS PER FEDERAL REGION

Project Managers Responding Per Region	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Other	Head Start Grantee	TOTAL (Percent)
I	2	2	2	0	5	11 (13.8)
II	0	3	4	0	2	9 (11.3)
III	0	2	1	0	4	7 (8.8)
IV	1	5	4	0	2	12 (15.0)
V	0	0	0	0	10	10 (12.5)
VI	3	1	5	0	2	11 (13.8)
VII	0	1	1	1	3	6 (7.5)
VIII	0	0	0	1	0	1 (1.3)
IX	2	0	0	0	1	3 (3.8)
X	0	1	1	1	2	5 (6.3)
IMPD	0	0	0	0	5	5 (6.3)
TOTAL	8	15	18	3	36	80
(percent)	(10.0)	(18.8)	(22.5)	(3.8)	(45.0)	(100.0)

A further breakdown of this classification is presented in Tables 5 and 6. Table 5 presents the numbers and categories of college departments operating CDA training programs at the 41 educational institutions noted in Table 4. As seen in Table 5, sponsorship of the CDA program varies at the reporting institutions, that is, it is not exclusive to Education departments. Additionally, no patterns emerge in relation to category of institution and college department operating the CDA program.

TABLE 5

COLLEGE DEPARTMENTS OPERATING HSST/CDA PROGRAMS IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

College Departments	Category of HSST/CDA Educational Institution			
	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Total (Percent)
Education	0	2	6	8 (19.5)
Early Childhood Education	1	3	2	6 (14.6)
Home Economics	0	1	0	1 (2.4)
Child Development	1	0	2	3 (7.3)
Human Resources	1	0	0	1 (2.4)
Extension Division (Continuing Education)	1	3	2	6 (14.6)
Special CDA Program	2	2	1	5 (12.2)
Combination of College Departments	0	1	4	5 (12.2)
Other Departments	1	3	1	5 (12.2)
Not Reporting	1	0	0	1 (2.4)
TOTAL (Percent)	8 (19.5)	15 (36.6)	18 (43.9)	41 (100)

Of the 80 programs responding, 36 are Head Start grantees receiving direct funds for CDA training. Included in this category are grantees that are primarily responsible for organizing and delivering training, those that supplement their training with courses from educational institutions, and those grantees that delegate responsibility for training to a cooperating educational institution. Table 6 presents a breakdown of HSST/CDA grantees into these categories.

TABLE 6

TYPE OF AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR CDA TRAINING
IN DIRECT FUNDED HEAD START GRANTEES

	Head Start Grantee Responsible for Training		Cooperating Educational Institution Responsible for Training	TOTAL
	Conducts own training	Supplements with courses from educational institutions		
NUMBER	7	12	17	36
PERCENT	20	33	47	100

The three remaining HSST/CDA contractors in Table 4 (included in the Other Category) are private contractors. It should be noted that these programs, while primarily responsible for delivering CDA training have cooperative arrangements with educational institutions in their service area.

Seventy-nine programs reported serving a total of 400 Head Start grantees through the CDA training program. An average of 33% of Head Start staff at these grantees participate in CDA training. Additionally, 40 of the 41 educational institution contractors report serving a mean of 7 Head Start grantees.

The size of the geographic area served by HSST/CDA contractors/grantees varies as does the nature of the area being served. Table 7 indicates the breakdown of size of geographic area served by category of CDA training program. As shown 53 of the programs, or 66.3%, serve large geographic areas, that is, either multi-county, state-wide or multi-state areas. The next largest number of HSST/CDA contractors/grantees serves single county units. Table 8 breaks out the type of area served by category of CDA training program. As indicated in the table, the majority of programs serve areas both urban and rural. The smallest number serves areas that are primarily urban.

TABLE 7

BREAKDOWN OF GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED BY CATEGORY OF CDA TRAINING PROGRAM

Geographic Area Served	Category of HSST/CDA Contractor/Grantee					
	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Other	Head Start Grantee	Total (Percent)
City-wide	0	1	2	0	1	4(5.0)
Multi-city	0	0	1	0	0	1(1.3)
County-wide	1	2	1	0	17	21(26.3)
Multi-county	1	6	4	0	14	25(31.3)
State-wide	4	6	10	2	3	25(31.3)
Multi-state	2	0	0	1	0	3(3.8)
Other	0	0	0	0	1	1(1.3)
TOTAL	8	15	18	3	36	80(100)
(Percent)	(10.0)	(18.8)	(22.5)	(3.8)	(45)	

TABLE 8

BREAKDOWN OF TYPE OF AREA SERVED BY CATEGORY OF CDA TRAINING PROGRAM

Type of Area Served	Category of HSST/CDA Contractor/Grantee					
	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Other	Head Start Grantee	Total (Percent)
Urban	0	1	2	0	6	9 (11.3)
Rural	1	1	3	0	12	17 (21.3)
Both Urban & Rural	7	13	13	3	18	54 (67.5)
TOTAL	8	15	18	3	36	80
(Percent)	(10.0)	(18.8)	(22.5)	(3.8)	(45.0)	(100)

HSST/CDA COST INFORMATION

Findings related to HSST/CDA costs are presented in this section. Responsibility for funding HSST/CDA institutions rests with the 10 Regional Offices of ACYF and the Indian and Migrant Program Division. Currently, 45 contractors and 336 Head Start grantees or delegate agencies provide HSST/CDA training to Head Start programs in all federal regions and to Indian and Migrant programs. All HSST/CDA programs in operation during the first preliminary information-gathering effort in the fall of 1976 and still in operation were included in the national survey with the exception of some in Region V. Region V has allocated all HSST/CDA training monies to each grantee in the region on a pro rata basis. Since this funding pattern

is new and not yet fully in operation, for purposes of this study information was collected only from the 30 Head Start grantees which had received HSST/CDA training in the previous year and are currently providing training. Thus, the total number of HSST/CDA grantees surveyed for this report is 82. The total number of HSST/CDA contractors or sub-contractors surveyed for this report is 51. The total number of training programs surveyed is 133.

HSST/CDA Funding Categories

HSST/CDA institutions receive funds by one of three methods: by contract, by grant, or by sub-contract from a grantee. This information is presented in Table 9. All HSST/CDA grants are received by Head Start grantees. Three programs of the 80 reporting indicated that no HSST/CDA funds were received

TABLE 9
CDA FUNDING CATEGORIES

	Grant	Contract	Subcontract	No Money Received	TOTAL
NUMBER	32	26	19	3	80
PERCENT	40.0	32.5	23.8	3.8	100

as yet. These programs were Head Start grantees in the process of writing CDA training plans or waiting for allocation of funds from their Regional Office. They expected to receive funds shortly.

Program Costs

The total amount of HSST/CDA funds received this year by the 80 programs reporting was $2,849,470. Of this amount, $2,001,033 was allocated to CDA training. The total number of slots for which 71 of these programs were funded is 2319 this program year. Nine programs reported that they do not allocate their funds according to training slots, and therefore are not included in this total.

Twenty-four programs, or 30%, supplement their CDA training monies with other funds. Seventeen of the 24 reported that the sum total of these funds is $287,249. The remaining 7 were not able to report the amount. The average estimated annual cost per trainee for CDA training, as reported by 67 (83.8%) programs, is $891. By comparison, the average cost per trainee[1] was calculated to be $1047 (N=68 or 84%). Table 10 breaks out the

TABLE 10

AVERAGE COST PER TRAINEE BY CATEGORY OF CDA TRAINING PROGRAM

	Categories of HSST/CDA Grantees/Contractors				
	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Other	Head Start Grantee
Average calculated cost per trainee based on total HSST/CDA funds, plus other funds used for CDA training.	$1230 (n=8)	$1516 (n=14)	$1295 (n=15)	$272 (n=2)	$695 (n=29)

1. Cost per trainee = total CDA funds (HSST/CDA and other) ÷ total number of CDA trainees.

cost per trainee by category of training program. As indicated in the table, the annual cost per trainee is slightly higher for colleges and universities than for Head Start grantees. The average cost per trainee for programs other than educational institutions or Head Start grantees is low by comparison. This may be attributed to two factors. First, field supervision provided by these private contractors is the responsibility of consultants located throughout the area of service. Frequently, one person travels to several central locations and thus is able to serve many Head Start programs. Second, these private contractors serve a large geographic area under one central administrative office. It should be noted that this organizational structure is not unique to private contractors. Several educational institution contractors have similiar systems.

HSST/CDA Project Managers estimated the percentage of CDA program costs that are used for various components of the program. The average (mean) percent of costs allocated to these components is:

Academic Training	29.2%)	
Field Training	48.7%)	= 100%
Administration	16.8%)	
Other	5.3%)	

Table 11 presents a breakdown of the estimated percentages of cost per component by category of HSST/CDA training program. Two year colleges, four year colleges, universities, Head Start grantees and others report that the greatest percentage of training costs goes for field training; for two year colleges, Head Start grantees and others field training accounts for over half the training budget.

TABLE 11

CROSS TABULATION OF ALLOCATION OF HSST/CDA TRAINING FUNDS

BY CATEGORY OF CDA TRAINING PROGRAM

Estimated Percentage of HSST/CDA Training Funds used for:	Categories of HSST/CDA Grantees/Contractors				
	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Other	Head Start Grantee
Academic Training	19.4	26.0	26.5	27.5	33.6
Field Training	50.4	32.8	46.5	62.5	54.0
Administration	21.0	27.3	22.5	10.0	10.1
Other	9.1	13.8	4.5	0.0	2.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Money Spent by CDA Trainees

CDA trainees were asked whether or not they spent some additional money for CDA training. Of the 392 who have responded to date, many reported spending money either directly or indirecly, for CDA training. One-hundred ninety nine out of 392 trainees, or 51%, reported spending some additional money for participation in CDA training. Ninety-eight out of 392, or 25%, spend an average of $15.35 per month on travel. Sixty-seven out of 392 , or 17%, spend an average of $11.10 per month on other things including photography film, film processing and materials for their portfolio. Forty-four out of 392, or 14%, spend an average of $25.95 per month for babysitting services. Thirty-nine out of 392, or 10%, spend an average of $10.80 per month on books. Nine out of 392,

or 2%, spend an average of $15.90 per month on tuition. Some caution must be exercised in interpreting these findings. While CDA trainees were requested to report the amount spent each month on the various categories noted above, it appears that some of the expenditures may be too high on a monthly basis. For example, the reported $11.10 spent per month on other things including photography film, film processing and materials for the portfolio appears to be inflated. A CDA trainee's portfolio usually contains some photographs, personal lesson plans, observations of children, descriptions and other related classroom data. It is most probable that the costs related to the photographs would be expended on a one-time basis, and would take up a large portion of the reported average. The other materials contained in the portfolio would be of negligible costs. Thus, this seems to be a one-time cost, and not a monthly expenditure for CDA trainees.

CHARACTERISTICS OF HSST/CDA STAFF

Information pertaining to the characteristics of HSST/CDA staff was obtained from the questionnaries returned by the project managers (80) and the field supervisors (225).

Functional Responsibilities of HSST/CDA Staff

The number of HSST/CDA staff has been broken down by primary responsibility, i.e. academic training, field training, administration, or other. This information is presented in Table 12. As can be seen in the table, there is some difference between the number of staff who devote their time to academic as opposed to field training. While more full time staff are assigned to academic training , more part time staff and total staff are assigned to field training. This may be seen as as an indication that allocation of training resources is in line with the ACYF requirement that at least 50% of the training be field-based in that more staff are hired to provide this training. It should be noted that in many cases

TABLE 12

BREAKDOWN OF HSST/CDA STAFF BY FUNCTION

REPORTED BY PROJECT MANAGERS

Function	Number of Full-Time Staff		Number of Part-Time Staff		Total Staff	(Percent)
Academic Training	126		82		208	(34.8)
Field Training	111		194		305	(51.0)
Administration	30		34		64	(10.7)
Other	8		13		21	(3.5)
TOTAL	275	(46.0)	323	(54.0)	598	(100.0)

Project Managers not reporting - 18 (22.5)

academic staff at contracted educational institutions also provide field training or supervision, whereas staff reported to provide field training usually are hired for that sole purpose. Thus, there may be some overlap between the numbers of staff reported in the academic and field training categories. Teachers at Head Start centers also provide field supervision to CDA trainees.

Characteristics of Field Supervisors

Two hundred twenty-five field supervisors (49%) returned the questionnaires. A breakdown of the number of field supervisors responding per federal region has been included in Table 2. The number of field supervisors responding from the various categories of HSST/CDA contractors and grantees in each federal region is presented in Table 13. As seen in the table, there is a fairly equitable distribution of respondents from all types of CDA training programs. Overall, more than half of the field supervisors who responded are employed by educational institutions, that is, two-year colleges, four-year colleges and universities.

TABLE 13

BREAKDOWN OF HSST/CDA FIELD SUPERVISORS RESPONDING PER FEDERAL REGION BY CATEGORY OF HSST/CDA CONTRACTOR/GRANTEE

Field Supervisors Responding Per Region	Categories of HSST/CDA Contractors/Grantees						
	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Other	Head Start Grantee	TOTAL	(percent)
1	2	11	12	0	9	34	(15.1)
2	0	5	2	0	4	11	(4.9)
3	1	5	0	0	10	16	(7.1)
4	0	6	12	0	3	21	(9.3)
5	0	0	0	0	16	16	(7.1)
6	20	1	7	0	2	30	(13.3)
7	0	1	3	0	4	8	(3.6)
8	0	0	0	30	0	30	(13.3)
9	24	0	0	0	5	29	(12.9)
10	0	8	12	1	3	24	(10.7)
IMPD	0	0	0	0	6	6	(2.7)
TOTAL	47	37	48	31	62	225	
(percent)	(20.9)	(16.4)	(22.3)	(13.8)	(27.6)	(100.0)	

TABLE 14

CHARACTERISTICS OF FIELD SUPERVISORS/TRAINERS

REPORTED BY HSST/CDA FIELD SUPERVISORS

Age	Number	Percent
21-30	75	33.3
31-40	86	38.2
41-50	43	19.1
51 and over	16	7.1
Not reporting	5	2.3
TOTAL	225	100.0%

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	20	8.9
Female	203	90.2
Not reporting	2	0.9
TOTAL	225	100.0%

Ethnic Group	Number	Percent
Hispanic	20	8.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	3	1.3
Black/Negro, not of Hispanic origin	20	8.9
Caucasian/White, not of Hispanic origin	177	78.7
Not reporting	5	2.2
	225	100.0%

Table 14 (Continued)

Highest Education Completed	Number	Percent
Some college	7	3.1
Associate Arts degree	8	3.6
BA/BS or above	208	92.4
Not reporting	2	0.9
TOTAL	225	100.0%

In responding to questions related to their experience working with groups of three to five-year old children, field supervisors reported an average of eight years, nine months total experience. The average amount of time spent in different preschool settings breaks down into the following categories:

Type of Program	Average Amount of Experience in Months
Day Care Center	14
Kindergarten	13
Nursery & Other Preschool	22
Head Start	33
Special Education	5
Counseling	6
Other	13

Types of experience given under "Other" were working with Sunday School nursery groups, vacation nursery groups, and play groups.

Demographic data pertaining to field supervisors indicate that the largest percent, 38.2, is between the ages of 31 and 40, and that the overwhelming majority are female. Over 90% have earned a bachelor's degree or higher. Table 14 illustrates basic demographic characteristics of field supervisors. These include age, sex, ethnic group, and highest education completed.

A comparison of ethnic group distribution for field supervisors with that of trainees as reported by project managers is presented in Table 15, and reflects the differences in the ethnic compositions between the two groups. As the table shows there is a marked under representation of field supervisors from all ethnic groups except white Caucasian not of Hispanic origin. It is not possible to determine whether this discrepancy is a function of the unavailability of qualified field supervisors from these groups or use of existing staff by academic institutions for these positions. Another possibility is that the responding field supervisors are not from the same programs as the responding HSST/CDA project managers.

TABLE 15
COMPARISON OF FIELD SUPERVISORS WITH
TRAINEES BY ETHNIC GROUP

	Field Supervisors**		Trainees*	
Ethnic Group	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Hispanic	20	8.9	422	24.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0	90	5.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3	1.3	1	.01
Black/Negro, not of Hispanic Origin	20	8.9	573	32.7
White/Caucasian, not of Hispanic Origin	177	78.7	664	37.9
Not Reporting	5	2.2		
TOTAL	225	100.0		100.0

*Trainee data as reported by 61, or 76%, of project managers reporting.
**Field Supervisor data taken from Table 14

Teacher Training Experience

Field supervisors also reported having prior experience training staff to work with young children. The number of field supervisors with varying types of prior experience is reported below:

Experience	Number of Field Supervisors	Percent of Respondents (N = 225)
Supervision of student teachers	94	41.8
Supervision of HSST trainees	90	40.0
Supervision of CDA trainees	137	60.9
Designing training materials	126	56.0
In-service/Pre-service training to Head Start Staff or other child care facility	189	84.0
Workshops	169	75.1
Teaching college courses:	126	56.0
- in early childhood education	90	40.0
- in child development	82	36.4
- special CDA courses	65	28.9
- other	50	22.2

Twenty-six of the 225 field supervisors responding, or 12%, reported having had previous experience as a field supervisor at another institution. In addition, 20, or 9%, have a CDA Credential, and 125, or 56%, have served as a member of a Local Assessment Team. Field supervisors reported being employed an average of 19 months by the present CDA training program.

Allocation of Time as a Field Supervisor

Forty-eight, or 22%, of the field supervisors are employed full time; 160, or 71%, are employed part-time; 12, or 5%, volunteer their services as field supervisors; and 5, or 2%, did not report this information. Field supervisors work an average of 18 hours per week; the range is from 3 to 60 hours per week. A breakdown of the average percent of time field supervisors devote to job-related activities is presented below.

Activity	Percent of Time Employed Per Week
Academic training	17%
Field training	60%
Administration	14%
Other	9%

CHARACTERISTICS OF CDA TRAINEES

Information on CDA trainees was obtained both from the project manager questionnaires and from the trainee questionnaires which have been returned to date. At this time 392 CDA trainees have returned their questionnaires. A breakdown of the number of CDA trainees responding per federal region has been included earlier in Table 3. The number of CDA trainees responding from the various categories of HSST/CDA contractors and grantees in each federal region is presented in Table 16.

TABLE 16

BREAKDOWN OF CDA TRAINEES RESPONDING PER FEDERAL REGION BY CATEGORY OF HSST/CDA CONTRACTOR/GRANTEE

CDA Trainees Responding Per Region	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Other	Head Start Grantee	TOTAL (Percent)
1	3	14	8	0	8	33 (8.4)
2	0	13	6	0	4	23 (5.9)
3	1	15	0	0	17	33 (8.4)
4	2	37	16	0	5	60 (15.3)
5	0	0	0	0	23	23 (5.9)
6	51	13	31	0	12	107 (27.3)
7	0	10	3	0	10	23 (5.9)
8	0	0	0	33	0	33 (8.4)
9	23	0	0	0	0	23 (5.9)
10	0	5	6	2	11	24 (6.1)
IMPD	0	0	0	0	10	10 (2.6)
TOTAL (Percent)	80 (20.4)	107 (27.3)	70 (17.9)	35 (8.9)	100 (25.5)	392 (100.0)

Demographic Data on CDA Trainees

Some basic demographic characteristics of CDA trainees, including age, sex, ethnic group and highest eduation completed, are presented in Tables 17 and 18. The data in Table 17 were reported by HSST/CDA project managers.

Table 18 illustrates the same characteristics as reported by CDA trainees. It should be noted that the project managers and trainees reporting are not necessarily from the same training programs. As a result, some differences do occur between the two sets of characteristics. For example, in Table 17 it can be seen that the greater percent of CDA trainees fall in the 21 to 30 year age group. This data was reported by HSST/CDA Project Managers. On the other hand, Table 18 indicates that the largest percent of CDA trainees fall in the 31-40 year age group. Project managers (Table 17) indicate that about 35% of the CDA trainees have at most a high school diploma or GED. In contrast, 21% of the CDA trainees reported this. In spite of these differences, the relative magnitude of each category within a characteristic is for the most part the same. That is, the largest percentage of trainees had some college but no degree as reported by both project managers and CDA trainees. The next largest percentage of trainees are high school graduates or earned a GED, and so on. This relationship holds for many of the characteristics.

In compiling the data for Table 17, some project managers noted that inofrmation was recorded by their programs only for certain characteristics of trainees, such as sex or age. Data pertaining to other characteristics, such as highest educational level attained by trainee, were not maintained in the records. As a result, the toal number of CDA trainees on which each characteristic is reported is not equivalent across characteristics. The percent of trainees falling within each characteristic division is available only for those trainees reported by the respective project managers, and thus the sum of these percents does not include the trainees for whom project managers provided no information.

Experience With Three to Five-Year-Old Children

CDA trainees have an average of 7 years, one month total experience working with three-to five-year old children. By far the largest amount of this experience has been in Head Start programs. CDA trainees' experience with three- to five-year old children can be broken down into the following categories:

TABLE 17

CHARACTERISTICS OF CDA TRAINEES

REPORTED BY HSST/CDA PROJECT MANAGERS (N = 80)

Age	Number	Percent of CDA Trainees
20 and under	8	0.6
21 - 30	537	39.8
31 - 40	495	36.7
41 - 50	249	18.4
51 and over	61	4.5
TOTAL	1,350	100.0

Project Managers not reporting - 23 (28.7%)

Sex	Number	Percent of CDA Trainees
Male	73	3.9
Female	1,776	96.1
TOTAL	1,849	100.0

Project managers not reporting - 14 (17.5%)

Ethnic Group	Number	Percent of CDA Trainees
Hispanic	422	24.1
American Indian or Alaskan Native	90	5.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0.1
Black/Negro, not of Hispanic origin	573	32.7
Caucasian/white, not of Hispanic origin	664	37.9
TOTAL	1,750	100.0

Project Managers not reporting - 19 (23.8)

Highest Education Completed	Number	Percent of CDA Trainees
Some high school or less	114	7.3
High school graduate or GED	437	28.1
Some college but no degree	787	50.5
Associate Arts degree	110	7.1
BA/BS or above	109	7.0
TOTAL	1,557	100.0

Project Managers not reporting - 24 (30.0%)

TABLE 18

CHARACTERISTICS OF CDA TRAINEES

REPORTED BY CDA TRAINEES (N = 392)

Age	Number	Percent
20 and under	8	2.0
21 - 30	102	26.0
31 - 40	143	36.5
41 - 50	95	24.2
51 - over	21	5.4
Not reporting	23	5.9
TOTAL	392	100.0

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	9	2.4
Female	373	95.2
Not reporting	10	2.6
TOTAL	392	100.0

Ethnic Group	Number	Percent
Hispanic	47	12.0
American Indian or Alaskan Native	25	6.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0.3
Black/Negro, not of Hispanic origin	130	33.2
White/Caucasian, not of Hispanic origin	159	40.6
Not reporting	30	7.7
TOTAL	392	100.0

Highest Education Completed	Number	Percent
Some high school or less	11	2.8
High school graduate or GED	71	18.1
Some college but no degree	219	55.9
Associate Arts degree	38	9.7
BA/BS degree or above	33	8.4
Not reporting	20	5.1
TOTAL	392	100.0

Setting	Average Amount of Experience in Months
Day Care Center	7
Kindergarten	2
Nursery & Other Preschool	4
Head Start	64
Other related experience	8

CDA trainees holding the positions of Head Start Director or Educational Coordinator have the most experience in the Head Start program. This group (N = 5) reported an average of 8 years, 8 months experience. Head Start teachers in CDA training (N = 138) reported an average of 7 years, one month of experience in the Head Start program. In contrast, classroom aides in CDA training (N = 174) reported an average of 4 years, one month of experience in Head Start.

Sources of Other Training

Some CDA trainees reported receiving training in early childhood education from sources other than HSST or CDA. Table 19 presents a list of training sources and the number of trainees receiving training from each source. Trainees also reported if the training was through an in-service or pre-service arrangement. The table indicates the greatest proportion of training received was through a Head Start grantee or delegate agency, and that this training was in-service or pre-service. A large number also indicated they received training through a college or university. We speculate that, in many cases, the training reported as having been received from colleges or universities was related to either HSST or HSST/CDA training. That is, trainees were reporting their CDA-related coursework at the college as independent from the field-based training component of CDA.

TABLE 19

NUMBER OF TRAINEES RECEIVING TRAINING OTHER THAN HSST OR CDA

SOURCE	Number Receiving Training	Percent of Total N=(392)	Number of These Receiving In-service, Pre-service Training	Percent of Total N=(392)
ACYF Regional Office	23	6.1	14	3.6
State Training Office	81	20.7	51	13.0
BEH Training Institution	8	2.0	7	1.8
Public School	66	16.8	26	6.6
Public/private agency concerned with handicap service	89	22.7	51	13.0
Community college, college or university	136	34.7	44	11.2
Head State grantee; a delegate agency	163	41.6	106	27.0
Professional organization concerned with early childhood	116	29.6	56	14.3
Other	38	9.7	18	4.6

Head Start Positions Held by CDA Trainees

As seen in Table 20 the greater percentage of CDA trainees are classroom teachers; the next largest number are teacher aides. The information in Table 20 was reported by HSST/CDA project managers. CDA trainees reported the reverse relationship between the number of classroom teachers and aides in CDA training (Table 21).

TABLE 20

BREAKDOWN OF HEAD START STAFF IN HSST/CDA TRAINING

Type of Training	Teachers	Aides	Non-classroom Staff	Total	(Percent)
HSST Training	343	185	403	931	(23.3)
CDA Training	1473	1434	165	3072	(76.7)
TOTAL (Percent)	1816(45.4)	1619(40.4)	568(14.2)	4003	(100.0)

Project Managers not reporting - 2 (3.6%)

Table 21 indicates the greater number of persons in CDA training are classroom aides. This discrepancy between the two sets of reports may once again be due to the fact that the respondents come from different programs. It can also be seen in Table 20 that the greatest proportion of non-classroom staff receiving training participate in HSST, while fewer classroom staff (teachers and aides) do so.

TABLE 21

NUMBER OF CDA TRAINEES IN STATED HEAD START PROGRAM POSITIONS

Head Start Position	Number	Percent
Teacher	138	35.2
Home Base Teacher	14	3.6
Classroom Aide	177	45.2
Parent Involvement Staff	1	0.3
Cook	1	0.3
Education Coordinator	4	1.0
Head Start Director	1	0.3
Center Director	35	8.9
Other	17	4.3
Not Reporting	4	1.0
TOTAL	392	100.0

One hundred ninety-seven CDA trainees (50.3%)reported having held positions in the Head Start programs other than the one they presently hold. Specifically, of 138 teachers in CDA training, 67 (49%) had been teacher aides at one time; 18 of the 138 (13%) had been social service, health service or parent involvement aides; 6 (4%) were cooks at one time; 3 (2%) had been cook aides; and 12 (9%) had held other positions such as bus driver or had been a parent volunteer.

Teacher aides in CDA training also gave evidence of career advancement in the Head Start program. Of 177 teacher aides 19 (11%) had previously been social service, health service or parent involvement aides; 12 of the 177 (7%) had been cooks; 3 (2%) were cook aides at one time; and 16 (9%) had held other positions.

Center Directors in CDA training provide the most dramatic evidence of career advancement. Of the 35 Center Directors reporting, 23 (66%) had been

Head Start teachers. Thus, these findings demonstrate that career advancement opportunities are available in the Head Start program. Additionally, based on these data reported by CDA trainees, it is quite prevalent.

Another indication of advancement within the Head Start program by CDA trainees is the prevalence of Head Start parents in CDA training. Fifty-six project managers (70%) indicated some of their CDA trainees were also Head Start parents. Fifty of the 80 project managers (62.5%)noted that 374 of their 1126 CDA trainees (33.2%) are parents of children previously or currently enrolled in Head Start.

As noted earlier in Table 18, CDA trainees reported their highest educational level achieved. As seen in the table, approximately 56% of the trainees have completed some college but did not earn a degree. The next largest group (18.1%) are high school graduates or have received a GED (General Equivalency Diploma), equivalent to a high school diploma. Almost 10% earned an Associate Arts degree, and fewer (8.4%) earned a Bachelor's degree or above. These statistics change slightly when comparing CDA trainees in teacher (head teacher) positions to CDA trainees in teacher aide (assistant) positions.

One-hundred twenty-two of the 138 trainees in teacher positions reported the highest educational level they achieved. Of these 132, 74, or 56% completed some college but did not earn a degree; 18, or 13.6% earned an Associate Arts degree; 24 or 18.2% earned a Bachelor's degree or above; and 15 or 11.4% are high school graduates or have earned a GED.

In comparison, 167 of the 177 CDA trainees in teacher aide positions reported their highest educational level. Of the 167 , 98, or 58.7% completed some college but did not earn a degree; 8, or 4.8% earned an Associate Arts degree; 1, or 0.6% earned a Bachelor's degree or above; and 50, or 29.9% are high school graduates or have earned a GED. Thus, 31.8% of Head Start teachers in CDA training as compared to 5.4% of teacher aides in CDA training have an Associate Arts degree or above.

On the average, the CDA trainee's classroom contains 19 children and 2 other persons work in the same classroom with the trainee. One of these persons participates in HSST training, and one is in CDA training. These figures indicate that everyone in the classroom is in some type of training. While this is possible, is highly unlikely to be the case. We speculate that the CDA trainees misinterpreted the question and counted the other persons working with them to be in HSST training whether they were or not. Also, when trainees reported on the number of other persons working in the classroom who were in CDA training, some may have included themselves in this count.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CDA TRAINING PROGRAMS

Information in this section has been collected from questionnaires returned from all three categories of respondents; project managers, field supervisors, and CDA trainees. It has been further divided into the following subsections:

- General information;
- Components of the training program;
- Training techniques and resources;
- Academic credit;
- Amount of time for training.

General Information

Seventy-one HSST/CDA managers reported that their programs were funded for a total of 2319 CDA training slots this program year. Nine of the project managers reported that they do not allocate "slots" for training. Seventy-eight project managers reported that CDA training programs are presently serving a total of 3072 CDA trainees, 1473 of whom are Head Start classroom teachers, 1434 classroom aides, and 165 non-classroom Head Start Staff. Forty of the 51 project managers maintaining waiting lists for CDA training reported 1037 names appear on these lists. Thus, an average of 26 persons per program are waiting to begin CDA training.

A total of 23 CDA programs reported providing CDA training for non-Head Start Staff. Of the 23 programs, 9 reported that tuition is paid by the trainee. Seven programs reported that these trainee's tuition is paid by federal or state funds. Five programs reported that tuition is paid by "other" funds. One program reported that tuition is paid by the trainee's child care program. The remaining program did not report this information.

Seventy of the 80 responding project managers anticipate a total of 3038 persons can be accommodated in CDA training next year (10 did not report this information). When asked how they would be willing to increase the number of trainees served in the event the CDA program expands in the next 5 years, project managers responded as follows:

TABLE 22

HSST/CDA PROJECT MANAGERS' REACTION TO CDA PROGRAM EXPANSION

	Number of Project Managers Responding	Percent of Total (N = 80)
Admit more CDA trainees to my program	33	41.3
Prefer to stay with same number of trainees; let another institution serve other trainees	1	1.3
Could double in size given appropriate funding	28	35.0
Could triple in size given appropriate funding	18	22.5
Prefer to stay with same number of trainees and increase services to trainees with additional funding	11	13.8
Other	12	15.0
Not Reporting	5	6.3

Project managers reported utilizing several criteria in selecting trainees for the CDA program. A list of various selection criteria and numbers of project managers using these criteria is presented below.

TABLE 23

SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CDA TRAINEES

Selection Criteria	Number of Project Managers Using Criteria	Percent of Total (N = 80)
High school graduate, or above	29	36.3
Leadership ability	25	31.3
Good job performance	43	53.8
Interest in pursuing BA/BS degree	26	32.5
Interest in Early Childhood Education field	62	77.5
Seniority in Head Start Program	28	35.0
Seniority in waiting list for training	26	32.5
Ease in attending program	19	23.8
Good physical condition	21	26.3
Age limitation	7	8.8
Not (no longer) eligible for HSST training	10	12.5
Completed Associate Arts degree	7	8.8
Completed BA/BA degree	5	6.3
Needed to fill training quota	19	23.8
Trainee preference	41	51.3
Need to upgrade trainee's classroom to meet performance standards	43	53.8
Trainee interest in building on previous Head Start (or other) training	48	60.0
Head Start grantee career development plan	49	61.3
Other	15	18.8

The most frequently utilized selection criterion is trainee's interest in early childhood education. Also frequently mentioned are trainee interest in building on previous Head Start or other training, Head Start career development plan, trainee preference, need to upgrade trainee's classroom to meet performance standards, and good job performance. Criteria used least frequently are age limitation for trainee, trainee completed BA/BS degree, trainee completed Associate Arts degree, and not (no longer) eligible for HSST training.

Seventy-five of the 80 project managers reported that a total of 363 trainees dropped out of CDA training this program year. The most frequently cited reason for trainees dropping out was that they left Head Start employment.

The second most often given reason for dropping out was that the family demands increased; thirdly, the CDA program was too time consuming.

Some CDA trainees reported that various conditions interrupted their CDA training. Of these, 36 trainees, or 9.2%, reported a personal illness interrupting their training; 26, or 6.6% cited the time of training as a factor; and 21, or 5.4% reported a family illness. Seventeen trainees, or 4.3%, reported the lack of support from a family member as the reason for dropping out; 13, or 3.3% a pregnancy; and another 3.3% a lack of transportation. Additionally, trainees reporting an interruption in their training have been in CDA training longer. These trainees (N=123) have been in CDA training an average of 1 year, 9 months. On the other hand, trainees reporting no interruptions in their training (N=236) have been in CDA training an average of 1 year 3 months. Consequently, it appears that these factors contribute to lengthening the time a trainee needs to complete the CDA training program.

Components of the Training Program

Field Supervision

HSST/CDA project managers reported that on the average a field supervisor is responsible for supervising 12 CDA trainees, a ratio of 1 to 12. The average trainer to trainee ratio ranged from 1 field supervisor to 1 trainee up to 1 to 37. The mean of the largest trainer to trainee ratio was 1 to 15, with a range from 1 to 2 up to 1 to 50. The mean of the smallest trainer to trainee ratio was 1 to 10, with a range of 1 to 1 up to 1 to 37. Field supervisors reported that the mean number of CDA trainees supervised is 11. This number ranged from 0 trainees supervised to 77 trainees supervised.

Field supervisors reported that they make field visits to trainees' Head Start center an average of 3 times per month. The number of visits per month ranged from 0 to 30. CDA trainees reported on the average that their field supervisor visits them once every 19 days, less than twice a month. This difference may be attributable to field supervisors and CDA trainees reporting from different programs.

CDA trainees were requested to indicate the activities that are carried out during the field supervisor's site visit to the center. A presentation of types of activities and the number of trainees reporting participation in these activities follows in Table 24.

TABLE 24

FIELD SUPERVISOR SITE VISIT ACTIVITIES

Site Visit Activity	Number of Trainees Reporting Participating in Activity	Percent of Total (N = 392)
Observation of trainee with children	351	89.5
Conference with field supervisor regarding trainee's performance	306	78.1
Discussion of CDA training materials (including discussion of CDA competencies, room organization, children's activities)	328	83.7
Discussion of academic work	266	67.8
Discussion of career development counseling	178	45.4
Video-tape of trainee's performance	51	13.0
Meeting with small groups of other trainees	214	54.6
Evaluation of performance by field supervisor	300	76.5
Self-evaluation	252	64.3
Preparation of portfolio for assessment by the Consortium	274	69.9
Other	30	7.6
Not Reporting	32	8.1

Both field supervisors and CDA trainees reported that the field supervisor spends an average of 3 hours with the trainee during every visit. One hundred fifty-seven field supervisors (70%) reported meeting trainees at places other than their Head Start centers an average of 2 times per month. These meeting places included a college or university office, the trainee's home, the field supervisor's home, and other offices or places.

Training Techniques and Resources

A large number (179, or 80%) of field supervisors reported that trainees undergo an initial appraisal, or preassessment, upon entering CDA training. The most frequently mentioned tools or procedures used in an initial appraisal were classroom observation, trainee self-assessment, and the trainee's application form. Sixty-nine percent (272) of the CDA trainees also reported having an initial appraisal.

A larger percentage of field supervisors, 95% (214) reported that trainees' experience and competence are periodically appraised during the training period. The tools or procedures most frequently utilized for this appraisal are classroom observation of the trainee, feedback conferences with the trainee, and trainee self-assessment.

Most of the field supervisors (204, or 91%) review each trainee's progress with the trainee at specific time intervals. They reported that this is done, on the average, every 23 days. Fifty-eight percent (131) of field supervisors provide vocational counseling to CDA trainees. Forty percent (89) of field supervisors reported that trainees receive vocational counseling when the person providing counseling feels it is necessary.

Over two-thirds of the field supervisors (162, or 72%) reported that they meet with Head Start staff at the CDA trainee's center to review trainees' progress and modify training plans. This is done, on the average, every 24 days. Seventy-four percent (167) of field supervisors reported that CDA training is supplemented by Head Start grantee staff such as the education coordinator, head teacher, or others.

Learning modules are used in many training programs so individual students can progress at their own pace and in their own learning style toward identified objectives. A learning module is defined as a structure for experiences and activities designed to help a learner acquire and demonstrate a specific competency or group of competencies in an effective and efficient manner. Project managers reported that 63 of the

80 programs, or 79% use modules, as a part of their training program, A list of the various CDA modules used by training programs is included in Exhibit I.

Of the 63 programs using CDA learning modules, 43 developed their own learning modules or extensively modified existing modules (Exhibit I) for their program's use. It appears that there is not a heavy reliance of HSST/CDA programs on any one set of training modules developed by either pilot training programs or other CDA training programs. It is possible to conjecture that individual copies of various sets of modules are obtained by programs as reference materials. However, an inference which it appears can safely be drawn is that HSST/CDA programs are largely relying upon their own resources in the development of training materials.

Supervised field experiences are crucial for helping trainees acquire the CDA competencies. Many methods are used in the field to help trainees acquire competence. Trainees were requested to select the three training methods they felt most useful. Of the 392 CDA trainees surveyed, 120 (31%) felt that having on-the-job discussions with the training institution supervisor or other staff was one of the most useful field training experiences; 90 trainees (23%) identified individual conferences with the training supervisor, followed by feedback and goal-setting related to the CDA competencies; 91 trainees (23%) selected demonstrations by the CDA staff, followed by group discussions as one of the most useful, whereas 77 (20%) felt that child study, that is, observing specific behaviors or doing case studies was. Finally, 51 (13%) reported that discussion groups or seminars relating the CDA competencies to classroom experience were most useful.

Academic experiences are not seen as separate areas of knowledge to be acquired and mastered but as essential theoretical underpinnings for helping trainees understand and internalize the CDA competencies. Several methods are used by programs to provide academic experiences in CDA training. Trainees selected the academic experiences that they deemed most useful. Of the 392 trainees surveyed, 158 (40%) reported that workshops, seminars

KIRSCHNER ASSOCIATES, INC.

EXHIBIT 1

SOURCE	TYPE AND USAGE
Kirschner Associates/Erickson Institute Chicago, Illinois	Comprehensive learning modules jointly modified from those prepared by the Community College of Denver - Used by 4 programs
Oregon State Technical Assistance and Training Office Portland, Oregon	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 4 programs
Idaho State University Pocatello, Idaho	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 3 programs
Forest Park Community College St. Louis, Missouri	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 2 programs
Texas Southern University Houston, Texas	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 2 programs
Community College of Denver Denver, Colorado	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 2 programs
Texas A and I University Kingsville, Texas	Bilingual-Bicultural learning modules - Used by 1 program
Boise State College Boise, Idaho	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 1 program
Far West Laboratory San Francisco, California	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 1 program
Oscar Rose Junior College Midwest City, Oklahoma	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 1 program
Pinal County Community College District Coolidge, Arizona	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 1 program
University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 1 program
Weber State College Ogden, Utah	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 1 program
Wheelock College Boston, Massachusetts	Comprehensive learning modules - Used by 1 program

and small group discussions provided the most useful experience; 115 (29%) felt that existing college courses were most useful; 81 (21%) felt that courses or lectures arranged on the basis of student interest or demand were; and, 77 (20%) felt that independent study or reading arranged with faculty members was most useful. Sixty-nine (18%) identified programmed instruction, prepared modules or learning activity packages as being most useful, while 61 (16%) felt supplementary reading assignments, followed by discussion were.

Academic Credit

The award of college credit for CDA training is offered by many CDA training programs. As indicated by project managers, 66 of the 80 programs (83%) offer credit for training. Table 25 presents a breakdown of categories of CDA training programs offering college credit for training. As indicated, all of the educational institution contractors offer credit for training. The maximum number of credits offered for CDA training ranges from three credit hours to seventy-two credit hours, with three programs reporting that an unspecified number of credits are offered for CDA training. Nine of the 14 programs not giving credits for CDA training reported the reason for this was that training is not provided by a degree-granting institution. Three of these 14 programs cited other reasons. One program reported that the state does not recognize the CDA as college credit, that is, the CDA Credential or competency areas have not yet been made equivalent to college credit hours. The remaining program noted that they were in the process of negotiating with their cooperating educational institution for the award of credits for CDA training.

The 66 programs that award college credit for CDA training do so upon different bases. The most frequently mentioned bases for granted credit were, in order of frequency:

- Combination of classroom and field training -- 22 programs
- Classroom course completed--21 programs
- Supervised field experience--11 programs

- Demonstrated competence--9 programs
- Field training completed--7 programs
- Verified past experience--3 programs
- Proficiency examination--2 programs
- Other (such as various combinations of the above)--5 programs

TABLE 25

BREAKDOWN BY CATEGORY OF CDA TRAINING PROGRAMS GRANTING CREDIT FOR TRAINING

	Categories of HSST/CDA Grantees/Contractors						
	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Other	Head Start Grantee with Cooperating Institutions	Head Start Grantee without Cooperating Institutions	Total (Percen
College credits for training	8	15	18	3	22	0	66 (82.5)
No credits for training	0	0	0	0	7	7	14 (27.5)
TOTAL (%)	8(10.0)	15(18.8)	18(22.5)	3(3.8)	29(36.3)	7(8.8)	80(100.0)

Frequently, the credit offered for CDA training meets course requirements for a degree program. Thirty-seven of the programs reported that the credit offered will meet elective course requirements for an Associate of Arts degree program; 41 reported that it will meet these requirements for Bachelor's degree programs. Thirty-two programs reported that this credit will meet non-elective course requirements for an Associate of Arts degree program; Fifty-six programs of the 66 offering credit state that the credit offered for CDA training is usually transferable to another educational institution; the remaining 10 did not know.

Many CDA training programs, especially those sponsored by Head Start grantees, make cooperative arrangements with other educational institutions for provision of CDA training. Forty-five of the 80 reporting CDA programs have made cooperative arrangements with educational institutions. A total of 131 institutions cooperate to provide CDA training. This arrangement may be as simple as purchasing a child development course for CDA trainees or may extend to delegating responsibility for CDA training to the educational institutions.

Sixty-four percent, or 29 of the 45 programs reporting cooperative arrangements are Head Start programs. That is, 29 or 81% of the 36 Head Start grantee CDA programs have cooperative arrangements with educational institutions. Of these 29 programs only 22 are awarding credit for CDA training. At this time, 7 of the 14 Head Start programs which do not award credit (Table 25) do have some manner of cooperative agreement with a degree granting institution. It is possible either that CDA trainees take specific courses at these institutions which are external to the CDA training provided by the Head Start CDA training program or that arrangements have not been made for granting credit for CDA trainees.

Amount of Time for Training

Field supervisors report that CDA trainees devote an average of 33 hours per month to CDA-related activties. This time can be broken out into the following categories in Table 26 on the following page.

Three hundred thirty-two CDA trainees (84.7%) reported that they spend an average of 22.1 hours per month in CDA training. CDA trainees were also requested to indicate the number of hours per month they devoted to various CDA-related activities. A breakdown of the average number of

TABLE 26

HOURS SPENT BY CDA TRAINEES IN CDA-RELATED ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY FIELD SUPERVISORS

TRAINEE ACTIVITY	Hours spent per month as reported by Field Supervisors
Preparing for field experiences	6
Supervised field training (observing trainee working with children and discussing performance with Field Supervisor)	12
Other assigned field experiences	3
Preparing for class	5
Attending seminars/workshops	5
Other (including portfolio preparation)	2

hours per month devoted to these activities is presented in Table 27 on the following page. There appears to be some discrepancy between these data and the overall average number of hours per month spent in CDA training. According to Table 27, however, trainees reported that they devote a larger proportion of their time to preparing for field experience.

Fifty-six of the 80 project managers (81.3%) reported that CDA trainees are granted work-release time for training. Ten project managers (12.5%) reported that they are not. Five (6.3%) did not report this information.

In theory, the CDA training program is individualized. That is, the amount of training and the type of training is tailored to an individual trainee's needs. Therefore, the time needed by a trainee to complete his/her CDA training varies. HSST/CDA project managers reported that the average planned length of their CDA training program is 1 year, 11 months. Similarly,

the average length of time trainees need to complete CDA training is 1 year, 11 months. Field supervisors reported that the length of time trainees need to complete training is 1 year, 9 months.

TABLE 27
AVERAGE HOURS SPENT BY CDA TRAINEES
IN CDA-RELATED ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY CDA TRAINEES

	AVERAGE HOURS SPENT PER MONTH AS REPORTED BY CDA TRAINEES				
TRAINING ACTIVITY	Release time	On-the-job	Own time	Total	(Percent)
Preparing for field experience	3	16	8	27	(36)
Supervised field training	1	6	2	9	(12)
Supervised field training with other Head Start staff	1	7	1	9	(12)
Preparing for class	3	8	7	18	(24)
Attending seminars/ workshops	3	6	2	11	(14)
Other (including portfolio prep.)	0	0	2	2	(3)
TOTAL (Percent)	10(13)	46(59)	22(28)	76	(100)

The CDA trainees reporting indicated they have been in CDA training for an average of 16 months, and plan to spend an additional 7 months in training, for a total of 1 year, 11 months in training. In spite of the length of time an individual has spent in CDA training, an individual's progress in the program is uniquely determined. Table 28 presents a breakdown of trainees' progress in the CDA program by the number of months in CDA training. As seen in the table, the largest percentage (65.2% or 255) of trainees reported that they are in the process of continuing CDA training. Many of

TABLE 28

CROSS TABULATION OF TRAINEES' PROGRESS IN CDA TRAINING PROGRAM
BY THE LENGTH OF TIME IN CDA PROGRAM AS REPORTED BY CDA TRAINEES

PROGRESS IN CDA PROGRAM	NUMBER OF MONTHS IN CDA TRAINING										
	0	1-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	31-36	37-42	43-48	49-above	Total (Percent)
CDA training complete; CDA Credential received; and, continuing in HSST training	5	4	5	2	4	3	7	1	1	0	32 (8.2)
CDA training complete; awaiting final CDA assessment; and, continuing in HSST training	3	6	10	4	10	3	3	0	3	3	45 (11.5)
CDA training complete; awaiting final CDA assessment; no additional HSST anticipated	1	5	12	1	20	2	4	0	3	2	41 (10.5)
Continuing CDA training	15	87	73	25	21	7	19	1	4	3	255 (65.1)
Dropping out of HSST/CDA	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (0.5)
Counseled-out of program	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (0.3)
TOTAL	25	103	101	33	45	15	33	2	11	8	376
(Percent)	(6.4)	(26.3)	(25.8)	(8.4)	(11.5)	(3.8)	(8.4)	(0.5)	(2.8)	(2.0)	(95.9)

CDA trainees not reporting - 16 (4.1%)

those continuing (175 of 255, or 68.6%) have been in training for 12 months or less. Whereas 34 of 255, or 13.3%, reported having been in training for over two years.

Upon completing CDA training, most CDA trainees (323, or 82.4%) plan to continue their education. Almost half of these trainees (156/323, or 48.3%) plan to work towards a Bachelor's Degree. Eleven trainees (2.8%) indicated that they already have a degree. One hundred thirteen of the 136 Head Start teachers in CDA training (83.1%) plan to continue their education upon completing CDA training, 146 of the 166 teacher aides in CDA training (88%) also plan to continue their education. It is thus readily apparent that participation in the CDA training program, while not necessarily being the instigating factor, at the very least fosters trainees' plans to continue seeking educational opportunities. Or conversely, it may be the career opportunities which attract many trainees to the training program.

Well over three-fourths of the responding CDA trainees (333 or 84.9%) do not plan to leave Head Start employment upon completing CDA training. However, 83 of the 333 (24.9%) plan to apply for a higher position. Specifically, some teacher aides appear to perceive the completion of CDA training and the achievement of the credential as an opportunity for career advancement within the Head Start program. Fifty of the 83 trainees planning to apply for higher positions presently hold the position of teacher aide, in contrast to only 15 who are Head Start teachers.

CDA ASSESSMENT

A total of 1147 persons from 78 (98.5%) reporting CDA training institutions have been assessed by the CDA Consortium. Of these, 666 were assessed by the CDA Consortium last program year; 359 persons have been assessed so far in this program year. One thousand eighty-nine persons from 77 (96.2%) reporting CDA training institutions have received the CDA credential. The difference between the number of persons credentialed indicates that 58 persons were not successful in receiving the CDA credential. It must be noted that one program did not report the number of persons

receiving the credential as compared to those assessed (77 versus 78). However, this program accounted for a difference of only 6 persons between these two statistics. Thus, one can conservatively state that at the least, 52 persons were not successful in receiving the CDA credential. Based on this survey, the success rate of CDA trainees in receiving the CDA credential is 95.4% (1098/1141).

Seventy-five of the 80 project managers (93.8%) reported that 1149 current CDA trainees have applied to the CDA Consortium for assessment. Three-hundred fifty-nine CDA trainees have been assessed in the current program year (reported by 77 project managers). Three hundred and twelve CDA trainees have currently completed CDA training but have not yet applied to the CDA Consortium for assessment (reported by 73 project managers). When these figures are compared to the number of Head Start staff currently in CDA training, 3072 (reported by 78 project managers), it becomes apparent that over one-third (1149/3072) of current trainees have applied for assessment by the CDA Consortium, whereas approximately 10% (312/3072) of those trainees who have completed their training have not as yet applied. This finding, that 10% of the current CDA trainees have completed the training program but have not yet applied for assessment, may be attributed to any number of reasons. One possible interpretation is that this finding may be a reflection on the complexity of the CDA application and assessment process as perceived by trainees. Another may be that Head Start staff, while valuing CDA training, do not value obtaining a CDA credential. Or it may be that at the time some of the project manager survey questionnaires were returned, late in the program year, these trainees had not yet applied for assessment.

Table 29 presents a breakdown of category of CDA Training Program by number of CDA trainees assessed. The table indicates that the greatest proportion of programs having no trainees assessed in either the current or past program year are Head Start grantees; 21/36 or 58.3% and 14/24 or 58.3% respectively. This result should be noted in light of the following: 1) Head Start grantees who are HSST/CDA grantees usually serve a smaller number of persons than HSST/CDA contractors; and 2) many Head Start grantees have only recently been awarded funds to conduct their own CDA training. Thus, the program may have either a very small number of trainees or may not have been in operation long enough to have readied trainees for assessment. Or, both may be the case.

TABLE 29

CROSS TABULATION OF CDA TRAINEES ASSESSED

BY CATEGORY OF CDA TRAINING PROGRAM

	2 Year College	4 Year College	University	Other	Head Start Grantee	Total (Percent)
HSST/CDA Grantees/Contractors Having No CDA Trainees Assessed in Past Program Year	2	4	3	1	14	24 (30.0)
HSST/CDA Grantees/Contractors Having 1 or More CDA Trainees Assessed in Past Program Year	3	11	13	1	22	53 (66.3)
HSST/CDA Grantees/Contractors Having no CDA Trainees Assessed in this Current Program Year	0	6	9	0	21	36 (45.0)
HSST/CDA Grantees/Contractors Having 1 or More CDA Trainees Assessed in Current Program Year	8	9	7	2	15	41 (51.3)

Project Mangers not reporting - 3 (3.8%)

Table 30 and 31 report projected assessment dates for current CDA trainees, as estimated by HSST/CDA project managers and field supervisors

TABLE 30

PROJECTED ASSESSMENT DATE FOR CDA TRAINEES

REPORTED BY PROJECT MANAGERS

Date	Number	Percent
March 1978	332	15.7
June 1978	442	20.9
September 1978	224	10.6
Later than September 1978	1117	52.8
TOTAL	2115	100.0

Project Managers not reporting - 8 (10%)

TABLE 31

PROJECTED ASSESSMENT DATES FOR CDA TRAINEES

REPORTED BY FIELD SUPERVISORS

Date	Number	Percent
March 1978	204	10.2
June 1978	505	24.2
September 1978	215	10.3
Later than September 1978	1167	55.8
TOTAL	2091	100.0

Field Supervisors not reporting - 18 (8%)

respectively. Both project managers and field supervisors reported that the largest percentage of their current trainees will not be ready for assessment until after September of 1978.

RESPONDENT OPINIONS ON THE CDA TRAINING PROGRAMS

Throughout sections of each questionnaire form, respondents were requested to offer their opinions concerning various aspects of the training program. In this section on the national survey of CDA training programs, we will report the opinions offered by HSST/CDA project managers, field supervisors and CDA trainees. We feel that these opinions are equally as important as other data presented in the report, and thus merit attention.

Effects of CDA Training Program

Project managers and field supervisors reported the changes that they believed to have taken place in Head Start programs as a consequence of CDA training. The numbers of HSST/CDA project managers and field supervisors reporting changes taking place in various areas is presented below.

TABLE 32

PERCEIVED CHANGES OCCURRING IN HEAD START PROGRAMS

Changes Occurring in Head Start Programs	Number of Project Managers Responding	Percent of Total (N=80)	Number of Field Supervisors Responding	Percent of Total (N=225)
Improvement in the way teachers work with children, parents and staff	66	82.5	186	82.7
More staff turnover	7	8.8	7	3.1
Trainees are more aware of their actions as teacher in relation to children's behavior and see children as individuals	69	86.3	206	91.6
No changes have taken place	3	3.8	4	1.8
Less staff turnover	7	8.8	20	8.9
Other	15	18.8	35	15.6

Project managers reported changes that have taken place at the training institution as a result of the CDA Training Program. This information is presented below.

TABLE 33

PERCEIVED CHANGES OCCURRING IN TRAINING INSTITUTIONS AS A RESULT OF CDA TRAINING

Changes Taking Place in Training Institutions as a Result of CDA Training	Number of Project Managers Reporting Changes	Percent of Total (N = 80)
New Staff added	21	26.3
Staff better trained	28	35.0
Training is now more closely related to the CDA compentencies	48	60.0
Training incorporated inverted curriculum (Trainees can take Early Childhood courses before taking other college courses)	37	46.3
Practicum in working with children revised (that is, increase in length, nature of field supervision changed, requiring work experience)	29	36.3
Other	9	11.3

It should be noted that only one of the Head Start grantee-sponsored training programs reported adding additional staff as a result of the CDA program, whereas nearly half of the educational institution-sponsored programs reported adding staff. This result may be due to the following: the Head Start grantees providing CDA training either delegate all or the major portion of training to a cooperating educational institution, or present Head Start staff assume the responsibility for training. However, the HSST/CDA educational contractors may hire specialists or additional staff to assume the major part of CDA training. This in turn would increase their present staff.

In addition to affecting Head Start programs and training institutions, CDA training has had an impact on Head Start classroom operation. Field supervisors were requested to express their opinion concerning the impact on the Head Start classroom and its operation through an open-ended question. Presented below in Table 34 are some of the most frequent responses.

TABLE 34

IMPACT OF CDA TRAINING ON HEAD START CLASSROOM OPERATION

Impact on Classroom	Number of Field Supervisors Responding	Percent of Total (N = 225)
Quality of services and instruction provided to children has been upgraded; individual needs of children are more specifically addressed	81	36.0
The CDA program has helped the staff assess themselves and find out their strengths and weaknesses in working with children and parents and upgrade their performance; trainees have developed more self-confidence	35	15.6
Trainees' skills and capacities have increased with the cooperation of Head Start teachers	16	7.1
The CDA program has reinterated the need for child care workers to be knowledgeable and competent in areas of child development, curriculum and parent-staff relationships	14	6.2

As seen in the table, CDA training has had its greatest impact in the Head Start classroom in relation to the effectiveness of the trainee in his/her interaction with children. Classroom staff are thus seen as more competent and effective, self-confident and better able to work with children and their parents.

Benefits from CDA Training Program

CDA trainees expressed that they felt they benefited from their participation in CDA training. The number of trainees who reported receiving various benefits is presented below.

TABLE 35

BENEFITS RECEIVED FROM CDA TRAINING

Benefits Received	Number of CDA Trainees Reporting	Percent of Total (N = 392)
Training will improve my skills in working with children	365	93.1
There is an opportunity to obtain college credits for training	290	74.0
Training will enable me to receive the CDA credential and professional recognition	342	87.2
Training will prepare me for a better job	264	67.3
Able to integrate academic work and "on-the-job" training experiences	284	72.4
Helped to plan my own training	209	53.3
None; I don't believe I have benefitted from training	5	1.3

Field Supervisors reported on areas in which cooperation between Head Start grantees and delegate agencies and the CDA Training program could be improved. The number of field supervisors reporting on various areas of improvement is presented below.

TABLE 36

AREAS WHERE COOPERATION COULD BE IMPROVED BETWEEN HEAD START GRANTEES AND DELEGATE AGENCIES AND THE CDA TRAINING PROGRAM

Areas Where Cooperation Could Be Improved	Number of Field Supervisors Reporting	Percent of Total (N = 225)
More access to trainees	44	19.6
Release time for CDA candidates for more training time	112	49.8
Trainees should have opportunities to supervise the classroom	53	23.6
Trainees should have opportunities to rearrange the classroom	49	21.8
More structured involvement of the trainee's work supervisor in supervised field experience	76	33.8
Coodination of CDA training with other training received	115	51.1
No need for improvement	28	12.4
Other	44	19.6

Greatest Strength of CDA Program

Project managers and field supervisors were requested to report what they felt was the greatest strength of the CDA training program. The information reported by project managers is presented on the following page.

TABLE 37

GREATEST STRENGTH OF THE CDA PROGRAM
REPORTED BY PROJECT MANAGERS

Greatest Strength of CDA Program	Project Managers Reporting	Percent of Total (N = 80)
Training is more relevant to the job in comparison to college coursework alone	61	76.3
CDA training assists individuals in attaining competence	56	70.0
Other	12	15.0

The data gathered from field supervisors regarding the greatest strength of CDA programs follows:

TABLE 38

GREATEST STRENGTH OF THE CDA PROGRAM
REPORTED BY FIELD SUPERVISORS

Greatest Strength of CDA Program	Field Supervisors Reporting	Percent of Total (N = 225)
Opportunity to know trainees individually	140	62.2
Able to see progress and increase competence in trainees	151	67.1
Training materials are relevant to training	74	32.9
Supervised field training leads to increased trainee competence	182	80.9
Other	35	15.6

Clearly, both project managers and field supervisors feel that the greatest strength of the CDA program lies in the field training component. They see job-related training, as opposed to academic work alone, as accounting for the greatest improvement in trainees' performance.

Areas Needing Improvement in the CDA Training Program

All respondents were requested to indicate the two areas they felt needed the most improvement in the CDA training program. Because their level of participation and involvement differs, each group of project managers, field supervisors and CDA trainees was presented with different alternatives from which to choose. Presented below are the responses for each group.

TABLE 39

AREAS NEEDING THE MOST IMPROVEMENT IN THE CDA PROGRAM
REPORTED BY PROJECT MANAGERS

Areas Needing the Most Improvement	Number of Project Managers Reporting	Percent of Total (N = 80)
Training should be more closely related to competencies	4	5.0
Field supervisors/trainers could be better trained	7	8.8
Training materials should be more readily available	20	25.0
Trainees are too far from training centers	13	16.3
More funds should be available for the CDA training program	51	63.8
Inadequate field supervision	7	8.8
Other	17	21.3

TABLE 40

AREAS NEEDING THE MOST IMPROVEMENT IN THE CDA PROGRAM
REPORTED BY FIELD SUPERVISORS

Areas Needing the Most Improvement	Number of Field Supervisors Reporting	Percent of Total (N = 225)
More time to work with individual trainees	143	63.6
Greater correlation of classroom instruction and field instruction	56	24.9
Work out scheduling problems concerning visitation of trainees	56	24.9
More adequate training or field supervision for trainees	42	18.7
Other	51	22.7

TABLE 41

AREAS NEEDING THE MOST IMPROVEMENT IN THE CDA PROGRAM
REPORTED BY CDA TRAINEES

Areas Needing the Most Improvement	Number of CDA Trainees Reporting	Percent of Total (N = 392)
More time with field supervisor/trainer	97	24.7
More academic training	42	10.3
Avoid repeating material I already know	73	18.6
More supervised field experience	28	7.1
Ensure that credit received for training is transferable to other colleges and meets degree requirements	114	29.1
Better training and preparation of field supervisor/trainer in early childhood education and the CDA competencies	26	6.6
Better coordination of field experience and academic training	23	5.9
Trainee participation in development of a training plan	19	4.8
The program is "OK" as is	106	27.0
Other	19	4.8

As seen in the tables above, HSST/CDA staff feel that the areas needing improvement involve serving trainees better. The issues involved are that more funds should be available for the program, and that more time should be available for working with trainees. Over one-fourth of CDA trainees feel that the program is fine as is, but many are concerned that the credit offered for training should be transferable to other educational institutions and that it meets requirements for degree programs. Also about one-fourth of the trainees feel that more time should be spent with their field supervisor.

In short, all groups strongly feel that more time should be available for CDA training in the field. An increase in funds to programs may be the answer, and in addition, this too may solve the problem of awarding transferable credit.

FINAL REMARKS

In this chapter, we highlighted the major findings of the national survey of HSST/CDA training programs. The results presented, while rather extensive, do not completely exhaust all the data obtained through the three questionnaire forms. A few of the items had inconsistent response rates, which coupled with the low respondent rate would have made any resulting analyses inconclusive. A second group of items duplicated information obtained on other forms.

The Appendix to this report contains summary statistics for all items on each survey instrument. Frequency tallies for appropriate items are presented for each federal region and for the total response per item. Means for respondents in each federal region and for total respondents are presented for items addressing ordinal or interval data.

Copies of all survey instruments are included in the appendix, Volume III of this final report of the National Survey.

CHAPTER IV

NATIONAL SURVEY OF HSST/CDA COMPETENCY BASED TRAINING PROGRAMS: CONCLUSIONS

In summarizing the findings of the national survey of HSST/CDA training programs, it is important to view the findings in light of the respondent rate. The data are based on reports from approximately 46% of all groups surveyed. One can speculate that those who were most responsive may be persons most dedicated to or having the strongest feelings about the CDA program. This hypothesis is made more credible when one looks at the CDA field supervisor data. The reporting field supervisors indicate that they have trained a large number of persons subsequently receiving a CDA Credential. Clearly, these field supervisors have made a strong commitment to the program.

A second aspect which should be kept in mind is that the questionnaires from the three different respondent groups (HSST/CDA project managers, field supervisors and CDA trainees) were not necessarily received from the same programs, and thus, may not reflect the true proportions of each category of respondent. For example, 41 out of the 80 project manager questionnaires were returned by educational institution contractors, whereas 36 came from Head Start grantees and three from private contracting firms. Any comparisons made between different respondent groups and between the respondents and the population should be noted in light of the fact that project managers from 85% of the 48 educational institutions responded as opposed to only 44% of those from the 81 Head Start grantees. There are nevertheless some interesting relationships which can be perceived.

Conclusions derived from the findings of this study are presented under two main headings. One includes general conclusions related to the characteristics of the HSST/CDA contractors/grantees, the field supervisors and the CDA trainees. The second includes conclusions related to the requirements for HSST/CDA contractors/grantees in the Office of Child Development (now ACYF) Instruction I-33-324-1-40 on *Head Start Supplementary Training Policy*, dated February 23, 1973.

CHARACTERISTICS OF HSST/CDA CONTRACTORS/GRANTEES, FIELD SUPERVISORS AND TRAINEES

HSST/CDA Contractors/Grantees

Educational institutions are the main providers of CDA training. Of the 80 HSST/CDA programs responding to this survey 41, slightly over half, were educational institutions. In addition, 19 of the 36 Head Start grantees responding reported having subcontracts with educational institutions.

While 30% of the HSST/CDA contractors/grantees supplement their CDA training funds, the vast majority of the training monies continue to be those specifically allocated for that purpose.

Only two (6%) of the Head Start grantees reported adding additional staff to provide CDA training whereas slightly more than 40% of the educational institutions reported adding new staff. One reason for this may be that many Head Start programs reported having cooperating arrangements with educational institutions for the provision of training.

Field Supervisors

Data received from field supervisors indicate that field supervisors as a group have had extensive experience both working with three to five-year-old children in various settings and as trainers or instructors in early childhood education. The assumption can safely be made that field supervisors tend to be selected from among those persons who are experienced both as teachers of young children and as teachers of teachers of young children. In addition, there are indications of in-depth involvement of field supervisors in the CDA system as evidenced by those who have worked at other institutions as field supervisors, have earned a CDA Credential themselves, or have served on an LAT. This data may also be viewed as an indication that the CDA Credential is becoming increasingly integrated into the child care profession.

Trainees

CDA trainees are predominantly female and between the ages of 21 and 40. Nearly all have completed high school and close to two-thirds have completed some college.

CDA trainees have had an average of seven years total experience working with three to five-year-old children. On the average six of these seven years have been spent working with Head Start children. This would indicate that those classroom staff in CDA training are part of a stable group of Head Start personnel. Training these persons to become CDAs should result in the desired improvement in the quality of child care provided in Head Start programs.

HEAD START SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING POLICY REQUIREMENTS

This section is divided into subsections which address the six criteria for HSST/CDA training programs and general provisions for institutions which are specified in OCD instruction I-33-324-1-40 on *Head Start Supplementary Training Policy*. These are

- CDA Competencies/Assessment
- Credit
- Supervised Field Work
- Integration of Academic and Field Experiences
- Individualized Training
- Flexible Scheduling
- Institutional Changes
- Career Development
- Classroom Staff
- Child Development Skills

CDA Competencies/Assessment

HSST/CDA training was to be designed so that each component related to specific CDA competencies with completion of the entire training program resulting in attainment of all the CDA competencies.

Sixty percent of the project managers reported that the CDA training was now more closely related to the CDA competencies. In support of this, over 95% of the HSST/CDA trainees who have been assessed (1089/1141) from the reporting institutions received their CDA Credential. In light of this finding, it must be noted that approximately 10% of CDA trainees have completed training but have not yet applied for assessment by the CDA Consortium. This may be attributed to any number of reasons. One possible interpretation is that this finding may be a reflection on the complexity of the CDA application and assessment process as perceived by trainees. Another may be that Head Start staff, while valuing CDA training, do not value obtaining a CDA Credential. Or it may be that at the time some of the project manager survey questionnaires were returned, late in the program year, these trainees had not yet applied for assessment.

Credit

HSST grantees, if they are colleges or universities, must offer valid credit for CDA training. Grantees that are not colleges or universities should work with nearby colleges and universities to obtain credit for trainees.

All 41 of the educational institutions responding to this survey offer credit for CDA training. The three private contractors and over half of the Head Start grantees (those with cooperating agreements with educational institutions) also offer credit. The amount of credit offered and the methods for awarding it vary, however. A few institutions give a certain number of credits to all trainees who receive a CDA Credential; others give credit only for courses taken. This latter policy may encourage trainees to continue in training, rather than being assessed, in order to obtain the maximum number of credits available.

Trainees, when asked which areas of the program needed improvement, wanted assurance that credits received for CDA training be both applicable

toward degree requirements and transferable to other colleges. Similarly, 74% of the trainees considered receiving credits for their training as one of its main benefits.

Supervised Field Work

Approximately 50 percent or more of the trainees' total training time must be spent in supervised field work.

The allocation of training monies by HSST/CDA contractors/grantees indicates that educational institutions have progressed from providing the primarily academic training of HSST to providing the more field based training of CDA. All of the educational institutions reported spending more money for field training than for academic training. The percentage of money spent by institutions for field training varies, from 62.5% for private contractors to 32.8% for four-year colleges. Of the educational institutions, two-year colleges allocate the largest percentage of their money to field training.

Further evidence of implementation of the field based part of the training is that all programs reported employing at least one field supervisor with an average ratio of one field supervisor to 12 trainees. These field supervisors visit each trainee in the field between two and three times a month. These visits last an average of three hours each. Thus, trainees receive on the average between 6 and 9 hours of supervised field experience per month.

However, both field supervisors and trainees expressed a need to be able to spend more time in this activity. Possibly related to this, project managers reported a need for increased training funds.

Integration of Academic and Field Experiences

HSST/CDA training must be organized so that academic and field experiences are integrated.

It is difficult to determine from the survey the extent to which the academic and field experiences are integrated. However, nearly three-fourths of the trainees perceived the opportunity to integrate on-th-job experiences with academic training as a benefit of the HSST/CDA training program. The academic experiences trainees felt were most helpful (40%) were those in workshops, seminars and small group discussions, while only 29% felt that traditional academic courses were most helpful. Of the field experiences which were most helpful, 31% identified on-the-job discussions with the field supervisor and 23% identified individual conferences with the field supervisor.

Individualized Training

HSST/CDA training must be individualized.

There are several indices from this survey that training is individualized. Eighty percent of the field supervisors report that trainees undergo an initial assessment upon entering CDA training. And 95% of the field supervisors report that the trainees' experience and competence are periodically appraised during the training period.

Flexible Scheduling

Training must be flexibly scheduled so that the length of training time can vary and so that exit from the training program depends on each trainee's acquisition of the CDA competencies.

The findings of this survey do not offer strong evidence of the flexibility of the length of CDA training. Project managers report that the average planned length of CDA training is 1 year 11 months. Similarly the average length of time trainees need to complete CDA training is 1 year 11 months. In corroboration of this, of the trainees planning to continue in training 67% have been in training less than a year as opposed to 13% who have been in training more than two years. Whether many trainees finish in less than the average time is open to conjecture.

Institutional Changes

HSST/CDA training was to be designed so that it met trainee needs rather than institutional requirements.

In reporting on the changes that had occured in their institutions as a result of the HSST/CDA training program, 60% of the project managers reported that the training provided by their institutions was now more closely related to the CDA competencies; 46% reported the availability of an inverted curriculum (that is trainees could take child development courses before taking courses in other areas); and 36% reported that the teacher practicum experiences had been revised at their institutions as a result of CDA training.

Twenty-three, or 29%, of the HSST/CDA contractors/grantees reported that they provide CDA training for non-Head Start staff. This would seem to indicate not only a healthy integration of CDA training into educational institutions but a demand for CDA training from child care givers who are not Head Start staff, and is one more indication that the CDA Credential is becoming accepted as an integral part of the child care profession.

Career Development

The HSST/CDA program was intended to provide appropriate training and career development to facilitate upward mobility for Head Start staff.

There are several findings of this survey which make it possible to conclude that this objective is being met. First, over 50% of the CDA trainees in the survey report having held positions in Head Start programs other than the one they presently hold. For example, 66% of the center directors had previously been Head Start teachers and 49% of the teachers had been classroom aides. Related to this is the finding that 33% of the CDA trainees in 56 of the reporting programs had been Head Start parents. Similarly, 67% of the trainees feel that their CDA training is preparing them for better jobs. Also upon completing training most CDA trainees plan to continue their education.

Classroom Staff

The HSST/CDA program was intended to provide training for classroom staff.

The findings of this survey indicate that the HSST/CDA training program is indeed training classroom staff rather than non-classroom staff. Of 3072 trainees in the 80 HSST/CDA programs reporting, 2908 are classroom staff. Further it can be assumed that many of the remaining 165 are educational supervisors of classroom staff.

Child Development Skills

The HSST/CDA program was intended to improve the skills of Head Start staff in delivering services to Head Start children.

Sixty-seven percent of the field supervisors reported one strength of the CDA training program as being the observable progress and increased competence of CDA trainees. And 93% of the CDA trainees reported that their training had improved their skills in working with children.

Finally, over 80% of both project managers and field supervisors report seeing improvement in the way Head Start classroom staff who are CDA trainees perform. And, approximately 86% of the project managers and 92% of the field supervisors feel that trainees are both more aware of their actions as teacher in relation to children's behavior and are more likely to see children as individuals. Apparently those persons with ongoing opportunity to observe CDA trainees fulfilling their teaching responsibilities can see marked improvement in their teaching behaviors. If this is consistently the case then the CDA training program may indeed be acheiving its primary goal of improving the quality of child care in Head Start programs.